

reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3289. Also, petition of Gordon R. Bimham and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3290. Also, petition of H. R. Fischuoller and 29 other residents of Spokane and Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3291. Also, petition of J. H. Abrams and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3292. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Ralph L. Wathser, Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3293. Also, petition of Albert Baker, of Washington, D. C., and 53 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3294. Also, petition of A. W. Edwards, of Washington, D. C., and 233 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3295. Also, petition of S. J. Rappapart, of Washington, D. C., and 12 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3296. Also, petition of Mrs. Alma Rappaport, of Washington, D. C., and 14 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3297. Also, petition of Charles Kucham and 99 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3298. Also, petition of William A. Stevens and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3299. Also, petition of Peter W. Senn and 60 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3300. Also, petition of Mrs. Jacob Devus and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3301. Also, petition of Elmer Markway and 54 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3302. Also, petition of F. Hummel and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3303. Also, petition of H. Koenig, Local No. 1, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of America, and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3304. Also, petition of Andrew Baum and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3305. Also, petition of J. Pfaff and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3306. Also, petition of H. Heiligenmann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3307. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of W. T. Moorehead of Roy, Wash., and 102 others, protesting against consideration by Congress of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, and condemning any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition, by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3308. Also, petition of the board of trustees of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, calling attention to the enormous quantity and food value of ocean fisheries, stressing specifically the incalculable benefits provided the Nation by the salmon fisheries of the Pacific Northwest; recalling the antebellum threats to the salmon and general fishing industry of the north Pacific coast by the invasion of Japanese and other foreigners; expressing apprehension at the possibility of such minatory interferences in the future; declaring now is the time to take adequate precautions against invasion by the Japanese and other foreigners; to be provided by the Secretary of State of the United States, with the cooperation of the Washington State delegation in Congress; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3309. By Mr. STEAGALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Dothan, Ala., urging the early consideration and passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, author of liberty, facing in these epic days determined foes who violate every cherished right which mankind has slowly won—and who would turn the wistful eyes of man backward toward the jungle, we thank Thee that more and more even the lurid glare of tyranny is revealing the spiritual glory of democracy as in Thy name it fights for its life. Startle us with the deep meaning for all mankind that a new moment has come in the old story of our planet. Strengthen our determination to seize the day as the full tide is at the flood to sail boldly out to wider seas of human rights.

"Create in us the splendor that dawns when hearts are kind,
That knows not race nor station as boundaries of the mind;
That learns to value beauty in heart, and brain and soul,
And long to bind God's children into one perfect whole."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 27, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 400) for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH, ADMINISTRATRIX OF THE ESTATE OF KATE E. HAMILTON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 108)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 514, entitled "An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton."

This bill authorizes and directs the payment by the Secretary of the Treasury to Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, the sum of \$7,025.60, together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum from November 23, 1939, until the date of payment by the Secretary in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for refund of the taxes erroneously paid.

Mrs. Kate E. Hamilton died intestate in Memphis, Tenn., on December 1, 1930. On December 31, 1931, Mrs. Blanche H. Karsch paid an estate tax with interest of \$26,017.15, and on January 24, 1933, paid an additional tax, with interest, amounting to \$1,400.40. Litigation involving the estate was not completed until 1939.

Mrs. Karsch filed a claim for refund on November 25, 1939, which was rejected on December 15, 1939, by virtue of section 319 (b) of title III (Estate Tax) of the Revenue Act of 1926 which provides as follows:

All claims for the refunding of the tax imposed by this title alleged to have been

erroneously or illegally assessed or collected must be presented to the Commissioner within 3 years next after the payment of such tax.

It appears that the court proceedings were instituted prior to the expiration of the date for filing claims for refund and that a timely claim to protect the interest of the estate could properly have been filed.

Congress has determined that it is sound policy to include in all the revenue acts statutes of limitations, by the operation of which, after a certain period of time, it becomes impossible for the Government to collect additional taxes or for the taxpayer to obtain a refund of an overpayment of taxes. This bill selects a single taxpayer for special treatment by excepting her from this policy. The whole body of Federal taxpayers is thus discriminated against, and a precedent is established, opening the door to relief in all cases in which the statute operates to the prejudice of a particular taxpayer, while leaving the door closed to the Government in those cases in which the statute operates to the disadvantage of the Government.

I know of no circumstances which would justify the exception made by S. 514 to the long-continued policy of Congress, and do not believe that the field of special legislation should be opened to relieve special classes of taxpayers from the consequences of their failure to file claims within the period fixed by law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 28, 1943.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ALEXANDER FREDERICK LABEL—SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION

A letter from the Attorney General referring to his letter of June 15, 1943, in relation to the case (among others) of Alexander Frederick Label, involving suspension of deportation, stating that new and additional evidence has appeared which warrants reconsideration of the proceedings, and requesting that the case be withdrawn from the Congress, as suspension of deportation is believed not to be warranted; to the Committee on Immigration.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the various units of his department for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Capt. and Mrs. James A. Ryan, of Honolulu, T. H., praying for the enactment of pending legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts; to the Committee on Immigration.

A letter from the president of the American Automobile Association, together with a resolution adopted by the board of directors of that association, favoring the appoint-

ment of a congressional joint committee to make a thorough investigation relating to petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A resolution adopted by the New Orleans (La.) League of Women Voters, favoring prompt agreement by the Senate in a proposal to the effect that the United States participate with the other United Nations and nations of like intent in establishing a system of collective world security; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1161, the so-called general welfare bill, granting old-age assistance, etc.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Selden, Dresden, and Jennings, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask leave to present for appropriate reference a petition signed by various residents of Portland, Maine, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petition was received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration a resolution adopted by the national affairs committee of the National Republican Club, and I should like to have referred with it the accompanying letter, although I do not ask to have the letter published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were received and referred to the Committee on Immigration, and the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB ON THE CHINESE EXCLUSION LAWS

Whereas there is a report, No. 732, of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in the House of Representatives and a proposed bill, No. 3070, now pending before the House, to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws and establish a quota for Chinese people and make persons of the Chinese race eligible for naturalization; and

Whereas these exclusion laws originated many years ago, primarily for the purpose of stopping the flow of Chinese laborers into the construction camps of the country, and for other economic reasons; and

Whereas much has happened since then to relieve the condition bringing about such legislation; and

Whereas the people of the United States and of China have established such firm bonds of friendship and understanding that the people of the United States are eager to remove any legislation that makes discriminations against the Chinese with regard to entry into this country: Be it

Resolved by the National Republican Club, That we respectfully urge the passage of the proposed bill, No. 3070, repealing the Chinese exclusion laws, fixing an annual quota for China, and permitting the naturalization of Chinese.

RALPH W. GWINN,
Chairman, Subcommittee
on Foreign Relations.
WILLIAM S. BENNET,
Chairman, Committee
on National Affairs.

Approved:

THOMAS J. CURRAN,
President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 921. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 487);

H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale; with an amendment (Rept. No. 488); and

H. R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 489).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 273. A bill to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 490);

H. R. 400. A bill for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt; without amendment (Rept. No. 491);

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Dalton; without amendment (Rept. No. 492);

H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 493);

H. R. 2182. A bill for the relief of John E. Haas; without amendment (Rept. No. 494); and

H. R. 2675. A bill providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a); without amendment (Rept. No. 495).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Andrew Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 496).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1290. A bill for the relief of William Carroll Knox; with an amendment (Rept. No. 497)

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Flanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 498);

H. R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 499);

H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of M. C. Roberts; without amendment (Rept. No. 500); and

H. R. 2824. A bill for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps; without amendment (Rept. No. 501).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list

of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 27, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; and

S. 1151. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1478. A bill to provide for the conservation and proper disposal of surplus war properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 1479. A bill providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1480. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 1481. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 1482. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of making possible the crediting under such act of certain periods of State service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1483. A bill for the relief of Marino Bello; and

S. 1484. A bill for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1485. A bill relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction without fault of their own was not completed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1486. A bill providing for the rendering and publication of opinions by the Attorney General with respect to Executive orders of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1487. A bill to implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign forces within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROHIBITING FEDERAL CONTROL OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR STATE PUBLIC-SCHOOL PURPOSES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDREWS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 88) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting Federal control of funds appropriated for public-school purposes in the States, which were referred to the Committee

on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO TERMINATION OF GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 193), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Whereas the termination of Government procurement contracts made in furtherance of the war effort has occurred and will probably continue to an extent which will create many complex problems involving the reconversion of American industry to peacetime enterprise and otherwise affecting the war and post-war economy of the United States; and

Whereas the successful prosecution of the war requires that the termination of such contracts be conducted and consummated according to policies and procedures which will be fair and equitable to contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers on the one hand and to the Government on the other: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, heretofore designated by the chairman of that committee, in connection with the termination of war procurement contracts, be authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation, in cooperation with such public and private agencies and such persons as it might see fit to consult regarding the termination of Government procurement contracts and problems relating thereto; be it further

Resolved, That such subcommittee be authorized and directed to consider and make recommendations to the full committee with respect to the subjects above-mentioned and all legislative proposals pertaining thereto which are now pending before the Military Affairs Committee or are hereafter referred to it in regular course. The subcommittee shall report to the full committee, which shall in turn report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of the foregoing study and investigations, together with its recommendations.

For the purpose of this resolution such subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable.

That the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist such subcommittee upon the request of the chairman thereof. The subcommittee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary and may utilize the services or facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

The powers and expenditures authorized by this resolution shall be deemed retroactive to the date when such subcommittee commenced its operations and functions following its designation by the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

FOOD FOR VICTORY AND JOBS FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Food for Victory and Jobs for Peace," delivered by the Vice President before a meeting sponsored by Food for Freedom, Inc., at Cleveland, Ohio, on October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address on the subject of collaboration for post-war world peace, delivered by him on Wednesday, October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATION, TOLERANCE, INDUSTRY, AND CHARITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address delivered by him on October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF WATERWAYS—ADDRESS BY COL. MILES REBER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address by Col. Miles Reber, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, division engineer of the Missouri River Division, before the Mississippi Valley Association meeting at St. Louis, Mo., October 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECLAMATION AND THE WEST—ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY W. BASHORE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Reclamation and the West," delivered by Hon. Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, at the twelfth annual convention of the National Reclamation Association in Denver, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN TRADE IN THE AIR AGE—ADDRESS BY JUAN T. TRIPPE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Foreign Trade in the Air Age," delivered by Juan T. Trippe, president, Pan American Airways System, before the thirtieth National Foreign Trade Convention, held at New York City, October 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

"AN" BECOMES AN ISSUE—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "'An' Becomes an Issue," published in the New York Times for October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to insert after line 9 a new section.

Under the order of the Senate of yesterday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gerry	Reed
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scrugham
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Desiring to have my position on the Pepper amendment placed in the RECORD, yet hesitating to take the time of the Senate at present to speak on the subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an interview which I gave to the Providence Journal, and which appeared therein on October 23.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEN EXPLAINS POST-WAR POSITION—SENATOR SAYS HE SUPPORTED CONNALLY RESOLUTION AS "BETTER THAN NONE."

Despite the fact that he and four associates on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee considered the Connally post-war resolution inadequate in a number of respects, they finally voted for it in its original form because it was "better than none." Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN said in a statement here yesterday.

Senator GREEN and his four associates—Senators WAGNER, MURRAY, GUFFEY, and PEPPER—sought unsuccessfully on Thursday to amend the resolution, but joined in approval of the measure when it came to a final vote.

He said he and his associates felt the resolution inadequate because of its lack of mention of peaceful settlement of international disputes, implied rather than expressed its reference to the use of force, spoke of "free and sovereign nations" rather than the United Nations, and was ambiguous in its language.

His statement follows:

"I am glad of the opportunity to explain the attitude of those Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee who, yesterday, proposed to change the draft of the so-called Connally post-war resolution.

"The amendment proposed was the result of objections to the wording of the Connally resolution based on its difference from the proposal previously made by Senators BALL, BURTON, HILL, and HATCH. None of those four is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee but certain of the committee members were in sympathy with that group and met with them and discussed proposed changes to achieve the general purpose they had had in mind.

"It was decided best to abandon the original resolution proposed by the four Senators and to seek to amend the so-called Connally resolution in the least degree possible to accomplish the desired result.

GROUND FOR OBJECTIONS

"The objection to the phrasing of the Connally resolution was on several grounds. In the first place, nowhere was any mention made in the Connally resolution of other means for establishing and maintaining peace than by the use of force. There was no reference to settling international disputes peacefully as was the fundamental purpose of the League of Nations. It seemed to us that emphasis should be laid on peaceful settlement primarily.

"Another objection was that the reference to the use of force itself was implied rather than expressed. The purpose of preventing aggression and of preserving the peace of the world was stated rather than the means of attaining that beneficent purpose. We thought it better to mention expressly the use of power, including military force, in order to attain that purpose.

UNITED NATIONS NOT MENTIONED

"Another objection to the Connally resolution was that it proposed joint action 'by free and sovereign nations.' No reference was made to the United Nations. We believe that the United Nations, having joined in winning the war, should join in setting up the peace. We did think also that they all should be included and with the addition of such free and sovereign nations as might be admitted by them from time to time. It may be thought by many that the terms 'sovereign nations' and 'United Nations' are coextensive, but it should be remembered that many people contend that some of the United Nations, like Canada and Australia, are not sovereign nations, and they might justify later action in opposing a treaty on that ground. It seemed to us that no language should be used so ambiguous as to possibly exclude Canada from the provisions of this resolution.

"Furthermore, if some of the United Nations are to be excluded they all might be excluded with the exception of one or two of the most powerful. It seemed to us that, too, would be unfortunate. In other words, the difference arises as to whether the resolution should make possible an alliance with, say, two foreign nations of those now engaged in the war, to the exclusion of the others. We believe that the changes suggested do not violate the principles which most of the members of the committee favoring the Connally resolution approved of.

LANGUAGE AMBIGUOUS

"We do think that the language of the Connally resolution is so ambiguous as to make it possible for those who disagree with those principles to say that they are supported by their understanding of those ambiguous phrases. In other words, the question is whether these principles we have recommended should be expressed openly and should be brought to the front now to let those Senators who disagree with them explain their position publicly, rather than to hide behind ambiguous phrases which mean different things to different persons and thus get votes on the floor of the Senate by those who would not otherwise support the resolution. We believe that two-thirds of the Senate would vote for the resolution as amended, although it might not get as many votes as the Connally resolution. We believe, however, that the clarity of statement would help the winning of the war, both at home and abroad.

"Finally, the five Senators, after the rejection of their amendment, voted for the Connally resolution, believing that such action was better than none."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, resuming my discussion of the pending amendment to Senate Resolution 192, I believe it will be helpful, particularly for the purposes of the RECORD, to place in the RECORD at this time the legislative history of the active effort which has been made for the past 7 or more months to bring a measure of this sort before the United States Senate and the people of the country.

Shortly after the convening of the present session of Congress a number of resolutions dealing with post-war policies were submitted in the Senate. I recall that among them were resolutions submitted by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. On March 16, 1943, Senate Resolution 114 was submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Ohio who is speaking. This became known as the B-2 H-2 resolution because of the initials of its sponsors. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 114) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

(1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

Mr. BURTON. That resolution was forthwith referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe it was on March 31, 1943, that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was appointed, to which there were referred not only this resolution but all resolutions dealing with this subject up to that time. While public hearings were not held by the subcommittee, nevertheless it has held many meetings, and the four sponsors of Senate Resolution 114 have been courteously afforded the opportunity to appear more than once in conference with the subcommittee in order that the issues involved might be brought before the Senate and before the country at the earliest possible date.

At this point many Members of the House of Representatives felt that there was something before the country which commanded their interest. As a matter of fact, this was the first time perhaps in the history of the country that on a major issue of this sort the Senate was undertaking to advise as well as to consent to a treaty of this magnitude. Therefore, in order that the House of Representatives might also have an opportunity to express its opinion upon the questions of foreign relations involved, especially as they might relate to later appropriations or might relate to later agreements which would call for some action of the House of Representatives as well as the Senate, there was introduced on June 15, 1943, House Concurrent Resolution No. 25 by Mr. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, which I will now read into the RECORD:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby express itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

On July 2, 1943, there was submitted in the Senate by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], both members of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 16, dealing with this same subject, and I ask unanimous

consent that it may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That this Congress favors (1) the prosecution of the war to conclusive victory; (2) the participation by the United States in post-war cooperation between sovereign nations to prevent, by any necessary means, the recurrence of military aggression and to establish permanent peace with justice in a free world; (3) the present examination of these aims, so far as consistent with the united war effort, and their ultimate achievement by due constitutional process and with faithful recognition of American responsibilities and American interests.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, shortly thereafter the Congress took its summer recess. During that time a number of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives felt that this was an appropriate opportunity to bring the whole question before the public. Already there had expired several months since March 16. There was great need, in the opinion of these Members of Congress, that the position of Congress, and particularly of the Senate, be expressed to the President, to the people, and to our allies. In order to assist in bringing this matter before the President, before our allies, and before the people, some 10 teams were organized consisting of a Member of the Senate and a Member of the House in each case, and in each case members of the opposite political parties. Each team toured the country and brought the matter to the attention of the public.

During the recess period there also were made several important speeches, to which I wish to make reference as indicating the progress the campaign was having. On August 27, 1943, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and also chairman of the subcommittee, made a striking address in Texas which has been placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and appears at page A3770. This statement is so clear on many of the issues involved, and is so clearly in concurrence with the position which I am taking at this time, that I wish to read into the RECORD two or three short quotations from it so as to indicate the progress the campaign had made up to that time. The Senator from Texas made, on August 27, this impressive statement:

So long as the nations imposing the peace shall be ready and willing to maintain that peace by the last argument of military force, it will live. The United Nations must, when our enemies are mastered, establish an international agency to determine disputes over boundaries, over all of the quarrels that lead to international war and to arrest aggression and criminal conquest.

Such an agency, unless invested with power to enforce its decisions, cannot survive. It must have authority to call upon member nations for troops and navies, when necessary, to enforce its decrees and impose upon aggressors and violators of the law of nations punishment for their crimes.

A little further on in the same address the Senator from Texas said the following:

The Senate of the United States will at an early date consider a resolution expressing the desire of the United States to join in the establishment of a world-peace agency to curb international bandits and robbers and to preserve the peace of the world. Such an agency does not necessarily imply that world conditions will be frozen.

A little further on in his speech the Senator said:

From our commanding point of vantage we must declare to the world that our influence and our might will be dedicated to the maintenance of world peace and the suppression of military aggression whenever it may lift its venomous head. The United States must be a member of the peace agency.

A little further on he said:

Russia must be a party.

A little further on he said:

Great Britain must be a party. Great old China must have a seat.

And a little further on the Senator from Texas said:

Other members of the United Nations must have a place at the council table.

Those statements, Mr. President, are of particular value to us as we consider the issue at this time.

On September 11, 1943, the Vice President of the United States, speaking at Chicago, made the following statement relating to the resolutions then pending under the title of Senate Resolution 114:

The first step toward getting the seven new freedoms is to pass through the Senate of the United States some such resolution as No. 114, which provides for the United States taking the initiative in calling meetings of the United Nations. This resolution looks toward a court or board to listen to international disputes, a military force to prevent military aggression, and the gradual addition of such other machinery as may be necessary. I am for the resolution as far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough.

The amendment pending before the Senate goes nearly as far as Senate Resolution 114 goes. It certainly does fall within the scope of that resolution, and goes to the extent that an endorsement of Senate Resolution 114 would mean an endorsement of the amendment now pending.

On September 12, 1943, the Secretary of State of the United States, Hon. Cordell Hull, made an important statement on the same issue. The entire statement is of great value in considering the problem. The statement has been placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of the remarks of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and appears at page A3775. I wish to read into the RECORD at this point two paragraphs from it. The first is as follows—Secretary Hull is speaking:

It is abundantly clear that a system of organized international cooperation for the maintenance of peace must be based upon the willingness of the cooperating nations to use force, if necessary, to keep the peace. There must be certainty that adequate and appropriate means are available and will be used for this purpose. Readiness to use

force, if necessary, for the maintenance of peace is indispensable if effective substitutes for war are to be found.

Secretary Hull then continued as follows:

Political differences which present a threat to the peace of the world should be submitted to agencies which would use the remedies of discussion, negotiation, conciliation, and good offices.

Disputes of a legal character which present a threat to the peace of the world should be adjudicated by an international court of justice whose decisions would be based upon application of principles of law.

But to assure peace there must also be means for restraining aggressors and nations that seek to resort to force for the accomplishment of purposes of their own. The peacefully inclined nations must, in the interest of general peace and security, be willing to accept responsibility for this task in accordance with their respective capacities.

On September 14, 1943, the Congress reconvened. Immediately the House of Representatives proceeded to the consideration of the issue. Before discussing that I wish also to make reference to one other event which took place during the recess. Although not officially an action of either the House or the Senate, nevertheless it reflected the considered opinion of a large number of governors of States of the United States and of Members of this body and of Members of the House of Representatives. On September 7, 1943, there was adopted at Mackinac Island the Mackinac resolution on foreign policy. It was unanimously adopted there by the Republican Post-War Advisory Council.

Among the members of that council particularly active in the drafting of that policy were the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Mackinac declaration of foreign policy to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**MACKINAC DECLARATION OF FOREIGN POLICY
ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE REPUBLICAN
POST-WAR ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER
7, 1943**

The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended, we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility:

(a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives would be impractical, and specific commitments by this Council, by the Republican Party, or by the Nation, would be unwise. We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end. But a specific program must be evolved in the months to come, as events and relations unfold.

Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an Advisory Council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization, perpetuating existing unity, may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for:

1. Its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation;

2. Its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

If there should be a conflict between the two, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our Republican form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

In addition to these things this council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversies; and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations.

In all of these undertakings, we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

It is determined that this council make complete examination of the means by which these aims may be fully achieved with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities.

The council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

Mr. BURTON. From that statement I read into the RECORD especially the following short paragraph as bearing directly upon the issue before us:

Therefore we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

It was in the light of that campaign waged both within and without the walls

of Congress that Congress reconvened on September 14, and without delay the House of Representatives proceeded at once to the consideration of the issue.

On September 21 the House adopted, by a vote of 360 to 29, as I recall, House Concurrent Resolution No. 25, the so-called Fulbright resolution, in the original form in which it was presented, with a slight amendment adding the words "through its constitutional processes." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point House Concurrent Resolution 25, as finally adopted.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President on September 24, the Fulbright resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Twenty days later—on October 14, 1943—the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted in this body Senate Resolution 192, the resolution now pending. Five days later, on October 19, the sponsors of the B.H. resolution, Senate Resolution 114, appeared before the full Committee on Foreign Relations and presented their recommendations for an amendment.

On October 21, 1943, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations approved Senate Resolution 192 precisely as originally introduced. Four days later the debate upon it began in the Senate, and immediately on that day 14 Senators joined in presenting the amendment known as the Pepper amendment, which is now being considered by this body. For the past 3 days the sponsors of the original resolution, Senate Resolution 114, have joined with other Senators in urging the adoption of the amendment. I believe the RECORD shows that throughout the past 7½ months many Senators have urgently pressed for action along the lines now proposed to be taken. There has been no lack of diligence on their part at any point. There is not now. We welcome the increased interest of the public and the increased interest of the Senate in the issue.

This brings me, Mr. President, to the point I had reached at the time when the Senate took its recess yesterday evening. I was then discussing the importance, to my mind, of maintaining military unity among the United Nations in time of peace as well as in time of war. In the midst of that argument I said that it is obviously to the advantage of each of the member nations of the United Nations to continue some such association. It is obviously unnecessary to destroy the unity of such nations through the discussion of proposed changes in

the form in which such military relationship shall continue in the days after the armistice, as compared with the days before the armistice. If need be, it can continue in precisely the same form as that of the military association which now exists, and that would eliminate the necessity for considering any amendment of form at the time.

A further reason for emphasizing the wisdom of this continued military unity among the United Nations is found in the development of aviation since World War No. 1. In past ages, and even at the end of World War No. 1, the military unity of the Allies and any program of continued association of their military forces was seriously handicapped in its practical value by the great difficulty of sending those forces to the point of danger in sufficient time to check military aggression at its inception.

In this regard, an analogy to a city fire department is helpful. It is well recognized in fire-fighting policy that while there is value in highly developed fire-fighting equipment, the greatest and most practical value of any fire department rests upon its ability to reach a fire quickly while the fire still is small. If the department can get there quickly most fires can be extinguished with a bucket of water or a single fire extinguisher. On the other hand, if the most highly developed fire engine is slow in getting to the fire it can do little more than to let the fire burn itself out and to attempt to control its spread to other areas.

With the development of aviation to the extraordinary degree of efficiency which it has attained in this war, it becomes possible for the first time in the history of the world for those nations which dominate the air not only to dominate the military situation, but to reach any new point of danger almost immediately and on short notice. Most points are far nearer to the important capitals of the world than a 60-hour flight. When the United Nations win World War No. 2 they will at the same time have demonstrated their dominance of the air. Their continued military unity in the post-war period, expressed especially through military aviation, will enable them to maintain military stability and to suppress military aggression in a far more effective manner than ever before has been possible. The enlarged navies of the world will also be available for global service on a scale heretofore impossible.

The increased value of military aviation adds much new practicality to the maintenance of the military stability in the world. It provides also for some continued appropriate use of a part of the tremendous investment in military aviation equipment which will be available at the conclusion of the war. This maintenance of the united strength of the military, naval, and air forces of the Allies will be far more economical than could be any program of competitive armaments.

The one international course which thus seems clear above all others in the light of our experience in this war and in the light of our having suffered two great wars in the same generation is that

we should retain intact in time of peace at least the military unity among all of the United Nations which has made that peace possible in the face of the greatest attack upon civilization in the history of the world. I may say here that this is not required by Senate Resolution 192 as introduced, but as I shall demonstrate later it is required by our proposed amendment to that resolution.

Added to the immediate military effect of this policy of continued military unity, it has at least two important indirect effects in the economic, social, and political fields.

First, it gives to the many smaller and weaker nations a natural chance for survival. Their safety is best secured through this means. In their safety from military aggression lies the foundation of their otherwise completely uncertain economic, social, and political stability. Correspondingly, because of the assurance of such safety, their primary reasons for upsetting the economic, social, and political structure of the world in their own respective interests no longer becomes a controlling consideration. Without this assurance their very struggle for survival introduces endless complications and uncertainties into the peace of the world in the future, as it has in the past.

Secondly in such a situation, for example, as faces Russia, the best alternative that can be suggested to her anxiety for controlled or allied buffer provinces or states is the substantial elimination of danger to her from beyond her borders. As long as the United Nations maintain in peace the same military unity that they have in this war there is little need for Russia to arm herself against the world. A substitution of such an accord, to be of the greatest value, requires that its extent be of the greatest scope. A universal accord would make separate large individual military expenditures and defenses both unnecessary and contrary to the spirit of the accord.

WORLD-WIDE POST-WAR ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL STABILITY

At this point we turn to the other long-term considerations of world-wide post-war policy. These involve the economic, social, and political fields. It is here especially that we should not attempt to prescribe or determine in detail the blueprint of the future. With each of these wide fields all the other nations of the world, and particularly all the other United Nations, are concerned as well as ourselves. It is important that the adjustment of these relations develop through the participation of as many as possible of the nations in the consideration of them. Even here, however, there are some aspects of these problems as to which much more can and should be done now than as to others. There need be no general rule for the problems presented, for they are by no means all of the same kind.

Beginning with a negative generality, first of all, there should be no official expression in detail or blueprint of the attitude of our Government or of our Senate issued now as to the solutions we seek in this field as a whole. Many of the

questions involved concern nations whose governments are now in exile. Other questions undoubtedly will require consideration and investigation extending over substantial periods of time. Still others may depend upon a free self-determination of the desires of the people in particular territories or parts of territories. Others may call for the exercise of temporary control by the United Nations as a whole or by one or more trustee nations designated for that purpose.

It is quite probably that the solutions to all of these problems should not be attempted at a single meeting or even single series of meetings. The solution of them should not be attempted by any one nation in advance of a meeting of the nations directly concerned with them. We may well give thought to the principles involved and to our own recommendations upon any or all of these problems in the light of the facts available to us prior to a further opportunity for international consideration of them, but we should not attempt to reach, or much less to announce, conclusions upon them.

On the other hand, some world-wide problems, especially of an economic nature, are of such immediate importance to the world that progress upon them as independent issues might well be made in advance of the consideration of other problems.

Incidentally, the personal associations thus developed through the international friendly consideration of these independent issues may be helpful in later considering others. The procedures developed in evolving solutions of these issues likewise may be helpful in providing procedures for the solution of other post-war problems. Among problems of this nature are those involving international aviation and the stabilization of currencies, to say nothing of the consideration of international loans and banking procedure. Whatever progress can be made along these lines should be made as soon as practicable so as to contribute to the stability of all nations, including our own, in planning their internal industrial and agricultural recoveries following the war.

It also may be well to agree upon plans of procedure for the subsequent consideration of the broader issues so that in the event of any termination of hostilities there will not be a period of confusion before progress is attempted on the world-wide economic, social, and political problems of the post-war period. Stability of procedure will be a great aid to the orderly post-war adjustment of international issues.

Insofar as formal expressions of opinion may be made upon any of these international economic, social, or political issues at this time, the important thing is to avoid limitations upon the scope of their free consideration at a later date. The best way to avoid such limitations is to continue planning, but to make no official reports on those plans now.

To illustrate the difficulty of attempting the consideration now of world-wide political readjustments, it is necessary only to think of the infinite variety of proposals which may be presented. The

important thing is that their ultimate solution be adapted to the particular time when it is reached. There have been natural, gradual, and important trends and developments in the relations between the nations of the world during the past 20 years which between now and the time for decision upon the world-wide political relations may well influence the solution to be reached. For example, while recognizing the importance of some international organization among the united and other nations so as to insure the unity of policy of those nations at least from a military standpoint, it is obvious that at present the brief document which binds the United Nations together is of an extremely limited type.

Its declarations are as follows:

First. Each government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

Second. Each government pledges itself to cooperate with the governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

It is primarily a military understanding and its force is largely expended when the war is won and a common peace is made.

The need for a continuing organization which will provide means for settling international disputes peacefully, whether they be of a justiciable or other nature, is one calling for joint consideration simultaneously by all the parties concerned in such an effort. In the past one of the difficulties in securing such a universal organization has been its relation to many regional issues. It may well be that the trend toward the decentralization or regionalization of some international issues will now be helpful in reaching an appropriate solution after this war.

Some over-all international organization, recognizing the decentralization of some questions among regional organizations, might be the natural development of the post-war period. Early consideration, therefore, should be given to a world-wide organization of some kind under the impetus of the unity of effort involved in the common conduct of the war. In view, however, of the countless alternative forms which it might take, it is important that definite expressions as to it, or proposed blueprints of it, be not issued officially by the United States, or by the United States Senate, at this time.

CONCLUSION AS TO POST-WAR PLANNING

This brings me to a statement of conclusions as to the post-war planning feature of this argument.

The preceding discussion demonstrates that there is unquestionable need for immediate post-war planning for internal stability within the United States on the part of industry, labor, agriculture, and the Government, including the Senate. It demonstrates also that there is unquestionable need for post-war planning for regional stability in the Western Hemisphere on the part of industry, labor, agriculture, and the gov-

ernments of the nations in the Western Hemisphere, including the Senate of the United States.

It demonstrates that in the field of world-wide stability, there must be, and there is, post-war planning being done by this Nation and by our allies directly concerned with such subjects of immediate emergency as those of the administration of occupied territories and the relief and rehabilitation of those territories. In this latter field there is especial need for participation by the Senate of the United States in the post-war planning because of the large appropriations involved and because of the grave necessity for not exaggerating to the world the amount and kind of relief and rehabilitation that is to be provided. Also on the question of military demobilization following partial or complete cessation of hostilities, further international post-war planning and consultation should be undertaken at an early date.

In the field of long-term, world-wide military post-war stability, I have demonstrated that there should be retained in time of peace the priceless unity already attained in time of war among the United Nations. The need for defining or developing any new form which this military unity should take is by no means as important as the continuance of the actual fact of the unity already gained. An important incident of this unity is its assistance in making possible great reductions in the international expenditures for the maintenance of military forces by the United States and by other nations in comparison to what would be the case if such unity were not retained.

In the field of economic, social, and political stability a few specific questions call for early consideration. Such questions as those of international aviation and international finance well may now be made the subject of common conference among the nations especially affected so that there may be no unnecessary delay or confusion in the establishment of international civilian trade and transportation as soon as opportunity offers for its resumption. Generally, however, in the field of economic, social, and political international post-war stability, activities now should be confined to informal study and planning, coupled with the development, if possible, of an international procedure for the early consideration of these issues in an orderly manner after the fighting has been completed. The degree to which these types of issues should be considered, and the manner in which such consideration should be handled, should be determined by the degree to which such consideration shall contribute to the winning of the war.

To emphasize further the obligation which is upon us here at home to do post-war planning and preparation in anticipation of the post-war period, I invite attention to a simple letter which a young soldier sent to his mother. In it he said:

Please don't change the furniture in the living room. Please don't change the pictures on the wall. Please don't change any-

thing on the mantelpiece. When I get home I want to see home the way I think of it and the way I dream of it.

Putting it in a larger sense, what this man wants to see when he returns to America is America in the way he thinks of it and in the way he dreams of it. He wants to see a land of opportunity where he and his wife and their children and their children's children can live and develop higher standards of living in peace and stability with a reasonable assurance of stability for many years ahead. He wants a victory worth the price paid for it. It is our great responsibility to see to it that such an America is ready for him. This cannot happen without the hardest and best kind of planning and effort. We cannot ask him to do this planning and work of preparation. It is our own responsibility. The need will not be met if we leave it to improvisation. The need will be met only through thoughtful common sense, businesslike planning, and cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture, and the Government.

This brings me to the separate hearing that there should be an expression of post-war policy by the Senate of the United States now, but it should be limited to certain vital fundamental issues of foreign policy.

Recognizing this demonstrated need for post-war planning and preparation just described, it is quite a different thing to determine the extent to which the Senate of the United States should give formal expression to policies along these lines in advance of the final presentation to the Senate of the concrete issues presented by a treaty negotiated by the President without the advice of the Senate.

Day before yesterday the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] raised a question as to the general wisdom of volunteering advice on this issue before it is asked for, and he cited the fact that the President of the United States had as yet submitted to the Senate no request for advice on this issue. The rule of conduct to which the Senator refers applies to the case of a person under no obligation or trusteeship carrying with it a positive duty to advise or to determine the course of conduct of others.

An entirely different situation, however, arises as soon as a person accepts a trusteeship or other obligation placing upon him the duty to advise and consent with others on important matters of policy. A trustee owes not merely a negative but a positive duty to discover and to perform the duties of his trust. Grover Cleveland well characterized public office as a public trust. It is in that sense of a trusteeship that the Members of the Senate under the Constitution owe a positive duty to the people of the United States to advise and consent on the making of treaties.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is a very able lawyer. As he made his remarks just now, it occurred to me—I think I am

correct—that there is a well-known principle of law that a person who is under obligation and duty to speak, and who remains silent, is thereafter forever estopped from raising his voice in protest.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator states the law as I understand it to be. That is particularly true in the case of a trusteeship. That is the position which I believe we occupy—a trusteeship for the people. Our obligation is therefore to speak, and speak now, as the Senator from New Mexico has so well said.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I assume that the word "advice" as used by the Senator is in connection with the language which relates to the obligation of the President to advise with the Senate after he has negotiated a treaty. Is that the "advice" to which the Senator refers or does he refer to the general obligation on the part of the Senate to report, as each individual Senator should, to his constituency on public affairs? If the Senator can tell me to which kind of advice he has reference I should like to propound another question.

Mr. BURTON. I will answer that by saying I refer to both. Of course, a Senator must also be under trusteeship to report to his constituents, but the language of the Constitution to which I refer does not place an obligation solely on the President. It does not say he shall ask for advice; it says, "he shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." There are examples in the past of the President having sought the advice of the Senate; there are many examples of advice having been rendered before decision has been reached, but in this extraordinary case it seems to me the example of the past indicates there is need in our trusteeship to speak rather than remain silent at the moment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, I do not disagree with the Senator on the general principle. The Senator will bear in mind that a year ago last September I submitted a resolution which was directed to the Foreign Relations Committee calling for the creation of what I called a foreign relations liaison committee between the Senate and the President. The purpose of that committee, as the Senator will bear in mind, might be multifold, but its primary purpose was to bring about between the Senate and the executive branch of the Government an exchange of opinion and of ideas out of which could be formulated the American concept of what the so-called post-war order should be. But the Foreign Relations Committee has not seen fit to give consideration to my resolution. Of course it might be said that has not been an unusual experience, but there has been no formulation of a definite plan.

As I see it, what we are doing here today is, first, to give ourselves a "shot in the arm"—and when I say "today" I

mean when we are acting on a resolution on this subject—we are trying to clarify, as Elbert Hubbard said, our own mind. When a man makes a talk, that is the main purpose of the talk, to clarify his own thinking.

Secondly, we are trying to give to our own constituents in this country an idea of what we think may be worked out between the international collaborators in the future. We certainly are not advising the President in any sense that would interfere with his constitutional power to negotiate a treaty; are we?

Mr. BURTON. Not at all. The Senator will recall in the original Senate Resolution 114 we spelled it out that we advised the Government of the United States to initiate meetings, but pointing out that it was entirely in the President's hands to proceed with negotiations.

Mr. WILEY. But is not the primary purpose of the debate here—I cannot see it otherwise—to assure the hungry heart of mankind, that, as I said yesterday, "Barkis is willin'," America is willing to do her part in negotiating and in collaborating, but that we recognize that that, as we have said, is a two-way street in which all must function harmoniously; we say to the world that we are ready to "play ball" with you if you are willing to "play ball" with us? Is not that the sum and substance of it?

Mr. BURTON. I agree to that, but, in addition to what the Senator has said along that line, I think there is an obligation to make our position clear to the people, as he says, and to the President, and to the Allies. Each of the three are definitely concerned to know our policy, which will be vitally affected by the clearness with which we act and with which they react.

Mr. WILEY. We agree on that. Can we make a blueprint, can we lay out a plan, when, as was stated yesterday by the Senator from Colorado, the plan, the blueprint, must be the result of consultation between the "architects" of all the contracting nations? In other words, we might have one idea, Russia might have another, Britain another, China another, and so on. It is our function to give and take, and, out of that, formulate an instrumentality which will bring about the constructive result which we want, to wit, peace, and an antidote to war. But we cannot lay down the blueprint, we can make suggestions. It is like marriage; man and wife have to give and take if they want to live harmoniously. Our problem is to work out a way that will result in harmonious international action, to the end that war will be wiped out; but I cannot see that we can now lay out a blueprint because the blueprint or plan is not the sole job of America.

Mr. BURTON. No, and I believe we should not. I thank the Senator for his clear statement for the Record.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said a moment ago something which I desire to have clearly understood. He raised the point that

nothing in the advice we may give could affect in any way the right or power of the President to go ahead and negotiate a treaty. There is nothing in this advice which would limit that right or confine him to the limitations of the advice given. I think that is very important, because the Senate should not take the position of saying, "Now, Mr. President, we have advised you thus far. If you go once beyond that advice any treaty you send to the Senate will not be ratified." I think that is an important point, and I want to say here as a part of the Record that every Senator who has spoken thus far has denied that kind of an interpretation. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] yesterday spoke of it as a limitation, but reasserted his belief as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has done, that this advice is not in any sense a limitation upon the right of the President to negotiate a treaty or treaties.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, the term "advice" has no effect upon the constitutional power of the President to negotiate. Of course, if the President should at any stage not heed the advice, the Senate has "its power"; it need not ratify the treaty. That is the way I view the word "advice." But, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further in this matter—

Mr. BURTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I think we owe an obligation to the country to clarify the issue here and make it plain that what the Senate is seeking to do on this floor in the debate is simply to give an expression of the concept of the Senate of its obligation in the inception step toward a possible treaty or international arrangement. It is not a treaty we are talking about here; it is not an international compact or agreement. Because of the attitude of our people and the attitude of the people of the world, who are entitled to have a forceful, straightforward, outright expression of opinion by the Senate of the United States, we are taking action.

I have listened to practically all the debate on the floor, and I am frank to say that, in my opinion, I could vote for either one of these resolutions. I think that there has been, to a large extent, something in the nature of a smoke screen thrown up, unintentionally, so that the people throughout the land think that here and now we are determining the destiny of the earth. I do not think that is true. I think that, by and large, all we are doing is saying to the citizens of this country and to all the peoples of the earth, "The Senate of the United States feels the world has turned a corner. This people is ready to cooperate if you are ready to cooperate; but we are not ready to sell our birthright as Americans in a deal with any international scoundrels or with any racketeers, international or otherwise. What we want is to sit down with fair

dealers and square dealers and try to solve the problem of war." It seems to me, Mr. President, that is the gist and the heart and the very nucleus of what we are saying in this debate. If there is anything else in it, I should like to have the Senator explain what it is.

Mr. BURTON. I think the Senator has well stated the issue we are facing.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The point last made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, that the office of Senator is charged with a trust in respect of the treaty making power, is a very strong point, in my opinion, and one I am glad to have him make in this important record he is making today.

I am sure it will not hurt his claim any if I ask permission to read into the RECORD at this point something on the same subject, a report by Representative TUCKER for the Judiciary Committee of the House, in the Forty-eighth Congress, in making a report which has become Document No. 16 of the Sixty-seventh Congress. It is entitled "Power of the President To Negotiate Treaties." This report was printed at the request of Senator Brandegee back in 1921, during the time when we were considering peace after the First World War. In the report the following appears:

It will not be denied that the power is exclusive; that is, that all which is involved in the power to make treaties is exclusively vested in the President and the Senate.

I omit a portion, to come to this point:

Even as to those matters, which are clearly within the scope of the treaty power, there can be no question that it is, like all other powers, a trust power, delegated to the Government for the great objects named in the preamble to the Constitution, and implied in the other clauses of that instrument. It cannot be so exercised as to defeat the purposes of the Constitution.

While it will be conceded that a treaty may make peace, yet it is equally true it cannot make peace upon terms which would surrender a State of the Union to a foreign power, nor make invasion of a State by a foreign power lawful, in the face of the duty of the United States to protect every State against invasion (Constitution of the United States, art. IV, sec. 4), nor to dissolve the Union, nor to change the Constitution itself, nor to divest the States of powers reserved to each by the tenth amendment to the Constitution, nor to deny the essential rights of liberty secured by its express terms to its people, as in respect of the habeas corpus, bills of attainder, and the like (Constitution of the United States, art. I, sec. 9). It cannot be held with any show of reason that these limitations upon legislative power, these duties imposed on the United States as a governmental corporate being, can be set at naught by a treaty of peace. Such a construction of the Constitution, besides being a reductio ad absurdum, is contrary to the whole framework of the system, and to its plainly expressed purposes.

So that it cannot be maintained that this power is absolute and unlimited, even as to the rightful subjects within its scope. As to such subjects the power is limited in its exercise by the plain and expressed or clearly

implied trusts upon which the power was delegated.

I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. In a moment. I am indebted to the Senator from Vermont for that excellent emphasis on the trusteeship of the public office of Senator, and I regard it as directly in line with the point I was making, that that trusteeship imposes upon Senators a positive obligation to speak, which might well be absent if we were not trustees and under no obligation, therefore, to take positive action.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. Is it not the sum and substance of what he just read that, while generally we say that a treaty is, with the Constitution, the law of the land, no treaty can in anywise interfere with the inherent sovereignty of the Government? In other words, without amending the Constitution itself we could not make a treaty which would strike at the very sovereignty of the people, in the sense that there would be a release or a loss of sovereignty?

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont for a reply.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that question is capable of being debated for a long time.

Mr. WILEY. I want to rest the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me undertake to respond even if I do not fully answer the question.

If the Senator is speaking of unconditioned sovereignty—notice, I do not say unconditional—if the Senator is speaking of unconditioned sovereignty, in other words, unconditioned nationalism, as we speak of it more recently in these debates, I would say that our trust would be performed according to law and according to fundamental principle and according to the habit of civilization, if we saw fit in a treaty of peace so to condition our nationalism, so to condition our sovereignty, as to meet the necessary conditions which are assumed by our vis-à-vis in negotiating the treaty. In other words, the word "sovereignty" is a boggy. This is a spurious issue, it is not a real issue. It is just one of those things we see in a great rush of public opinion in times such as these.

There is no ground of objection to the United States entering upon a treaty with other sovereign nations in which certain specified elements of international government, which ordinarily are exercised by us, are given up in consideration of a like surrender by our vis-à-vis.

I am not sure I have answered the Senator's question.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I think I follow the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I would agree if he would say that the

very purpose of making the so-called agreement, in which he said we surrendered something, was to make sure that our fundamental sovereignty was not surrendered. Then his statement would be valid.

Mr. AUSTIN. We are not surrendering sovereignty.

Mr. WILEY. Or losing the constitutional freedoms and rights provided for in the fundamental law of the land. In other words, the Senator read from a Supreme Court decision—

Mr. AUSTIN. No; it was a report by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, through Mr. Tucker.

Mr. HATCH. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, does not the Senator think that is a Supreme Court decision?

Mr. WILEY. I should say that the gentleman quoted by the able Senator spoke with the wisdom of such judges as I hope will grace the Supreme Court of the United States for many years to come, when he said that we could not by treaty give up the sovereignty of a State, and could not by treaty take away from the people their constitutional rights, and so on.

The Senator from Ohio has been very kind but, of course, he understands our primary reason is to give him a breathing spell. I do not think the word "sovereignty" has exactly the connotation which the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] applies to it. As I speak of sovereignty, I speak of something which is precious. I speak of that which my grandfather obtained when he came to this country. Although he still could not understand the English language, he could obtain 160 acres of land and own that land himself. As a boy, going to his farm, I remember he would dig his fingers into the soil and hold up some of it. He loved the soil. He exercised American sovereignty over 160 acres of land, and he never forgot that that was his soil. He left his homeland, and came to this country. He could not then read the language. He went to the town meetings and learned to exercise his right to vote. When he did that something came into his blood and his bones which made him stand erect, for in his homeland he was not competent to own land or to vote or to hold public office. After he came to this country he became inspired with something called American sovereignty, and he was a part of the national sovereignty. I say that I do not think we, as trustees, can barter that thing away—the sovereignty of the State or the people. Certainly each one of us, as a Senator of the United States, is a trustee of his State, not only in the exercise of one function but of all functions. The sense in which I speak of sovereignty is that we cannot, by a treaty, take from a citizen his inherent rights which were derived from God Almighty. That is fundamental in the Constitution. I want it plainly understood that, in any resolution I vote for here, there is no attempt on my part to say to anyone, to the Senate, or the President, that sovereignty, in that sense, can be taken away by treaty.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator from Wisconsin has agreed with me, although he does not realize it.

Mr. WILEY. I believe we are not far apart.

Mr. AUSTIN. The sovereignty of the United States cannot be given away by treaty or in any other way under the sun.

Mr. WILEY. I agree.

Mr. AUSTIN. That cannot be done.

Therefore, it is a serious matter to be talking about sovereignty when that is not the thing with which we are dealing. When we talk about a sovereign nation we are simply speaking of a unit of government. But I will try to show, when the proper time comes for me to do so, the difference between the noun "sovereignty" and the words "sovereign nations." Sovereignty does not die when the king dies in a royal government. Sovereignty does not die if men fail to perform their trusts. Thank God, sovereignty lives on, and it is the most indestructible thing in the United States. It is the spirit of the United States, and it is far above the law, and it is never suspended and never dies until the country dies.

Mr. President, we are not going to make any treaty or try to make any treaty which would destroy the United States or destroy any substantial part of it, or change the allegiance of the people of the Government of the United States in any way at all; but it would be to stultify the Government to say that because we are a sovereign state we cannot enter into a treaty with our neighbors and suspend for the time being some particular function of government in consideration of the other government suspending a corresponding function.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LOUGHEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BURTON. I shall be glad to yield, but I wish to say that there really is a limitation on the time I have to speak, because other Senators are to follow me, and I should like to ask the Senator to be quite brief.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I shall be. With reference to the very cogent remarks the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has made I think I should like to say, so it may be in the RECORD, that sovereignty in this country is in the people and, therefore, it cannot be destroyed so long as the people live.

Mr. AUSTIN. I agree.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The people have delegated certain powers to the Senate of the United States as being representative of the people. The question now is, To what extent has any part of the power of the people been delegated to the Congress of the United States and to the United States Government? As the Senator from Vermont has said, sovereignty

of a government and sovereign nations are two different things, because a nation may be sovereign when sovereignty does not reside in the people.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true. I agree with what the Senator from Minnesota has said.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to say that I agree with the conclusions of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. However, I desire to call attention to the old fable of the boy who lived two or three thousand years ago, who loved his camel so well that he permitted him to put his nose under the flap of the tent. Pretty soon the camel worked his shoulders under the tent, and then the remainder of his anatomy, so there was no room for the boy in the tent.

Mr. President, what I wish to make sure of is that in our dealings now we, as trustees—and, oh, what a world of meaning the word "trustees" implies—we as trustees will not be affected by a mirage so that we lose the wisdom and vision necessary in acting for America in this crucial period of the world's history. A trustee cannot handle things as if they were his own. The things he handles as trustee are sacred. They belong to those who have constituted him a trustee.

Mr. President, today I am reminded of that ancient land called Greece, the land of Pericles, of Anaxagoras, of Euripides, Socrates, and Plato, the land of Homer and of Aristotle, the mother of art, of oratory, of philosophy, mythology, and literature, a land of beauty, soul, and flame, which brought light to Europe and the world. Three years ago today, according to a newspaper article which I hold in my hand and which I shall presently ask to have placed in the RECORD, there was a man who claimed sovereignty over Greece. His name was Mussolini. He told Greece "where to get off," but Greece did not obey him. She fought to sustain her sovereignty, and put up a tremendous battle. Mussolini then called on Hitler, and together they raped Greece. They slaughtered Greeks by the tens of thousands, and the sovereignty of Greece went out the window.

I do not want any such thing to happen here, Mr. President. In America the sons of old Hellas are making it sure that it shall not happen here. America will soon liberate Greece from the heel of Hitler, and once more Greece shall be free. The words of Byron come to me:

The isles of Greece! the isles of Greece!
Where burning Sappho loved and sung,
Where grew the arts of war and peace,
Where Delos rose and Phoebus sprung!
Eternal summer gilds them yet,
But all, except their sun, is set,

The mountains look on Marathon—
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone,
I dreamed that Greece might still be free;
For, standing on the Persians' grave,
I could not deem myself a slave.

I ask that a short article appearing in the Washington News of this date, by William Philip Simms, under the heading "Debt to Greece," be printed in the

RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT TO GREECE

(By William Philip Simms)

At 3 o'clock in the morning of October 28, 1940—just 3 years ago today—occurred one of those relatively minor incidents which later on writers record as a turning point in history.

The incident was Italy's ultimatum to Greece. Rome charged Athens with allowing the British to use Greek bases and, true to form, the Italian dictator gave Greece just 3 hours to back down. Her curt "no" changed the whole course of events in southeastern Europe if not of the war itself.

Unquestionably Hitler wished the Balkans to remain quiet. What he wanted from that area was friendly neutrality, oil, foodstuffs, and raw materials. War would upset the economy of the region and possibly hamper his plans rapidly to defeat Russia, knock out Britain, and end the war by the winter of 1941.

Little Greece, with less population than New York and smaller than Florida, upset the Axis apple cart. At 5:30 a. m. Italian troops crossed the Albanian frontier and the war was on. Mussolini had been told it would be a walkover, that the country was lousy with fifth columnists, that the Greeks wouldn't fight. The Greek Navy consisted of one old cruiser, 10 destroyers, and a few smaller craft. The Italian Fleet ranked only after the American, British, and Japanese. The Greek Army had only 10 divisions ready for battle, and even these were without modern equipment. They had no tanks, almost no heavy artillery, and only about 200 obsolete planes. The Italians were not only mechanized, but every division was composed of veterans who had learned their trade in Spain. On paper, Greece did not have a chance. If Duce certainly thought so, and his blunder helped the Axis lose the war.

What the Greeks lacked in equipment they made up in spunk. With their planes, the Italians leveled Greek villages. With their Fiat tanks, they blazed their advance. Five columns penetrated Greece and for a time her plight seemed hopeless. But presently the Italians slowed down, then stopped. The light mountain batteries of the Greeks, hauled to the peaks by main strength and awkwardness, picked off enemy tanks, one by one. Light machine guns, hidden high up among the crags, mowed down Italian infantry slogging through the passes and utterly demoralized them. Soon Mussolini's men were in full retreat, back into Albania whence they started.

Hitler's fear had been well-founded. Much as he hated to do it, he found it necessary to go to the rescue of his pal. Otherwise the whole Balkans would explode in his face. He began to work on Yugoslavia. He frightened the government of the regent, Prince Paul, into joining the Axis in March 1941, but there was a military revolt, young King Peter II assumed his royal powers and Yugoslavia joined the Allies.

What Hitler had wanted of Yugoslavia was an easy road to Greece. Now he was in a worse fix than ever. He not only had to put Greece down, but Yugoslavia as well. And this would take time and men. Eventually, of course, all this was done, but before Yugoslavia and Greece and Crete were occupied the Axis had received a staggering and unexpected set-back.

Today, therefore, is one of the real anniversaries of the United Nations. Paraphrasing Prime Minister Churchill, seldom have so many great nations owed so much to one so little.

Almost certainly the next few months will see a major Allied invasion of southeastern Europe, and its success will be due in no small part to the firm stand of King George II of Greece and his little, poorly equipped army.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Iowa. I believe he wishes to make a correction in the RECORD.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on Monday, when there was a colloquy on the floor—I believe I held the floor at the time—with reference to the interpretation of the words “free and sovereign nations” as applied to the Governments which have adhered to the United Nations document, I expressed the opinion that three of these governments so adhering, the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, India, and the Commonwealth of the Philippines would not come under the definition of “free and sovereign nations.” At that time I was not aware that we have exchanged representatives with the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, and that it is to all intents and purposes a free and sovereign nation. The representatives of that nation have asked me to make the correction on the floor. I now confess my ignorance of that fact, and say that in my opinion Luxemburg would be in the same category as the other governments in exile which have adhered to the United Nations and exchanged representatives.

I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to permit me to read a few short excerpts from Hackworth's Digest of International Law with respect to the relation of Senate advice to the negotiation of treaties?

Mr. BURTON. I should be glad to have the Senator do so at this point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I read from page 27, volume 5:

In the United States, negotiation of treaties is an Executive function. In upholding the validity of the arms embargo with respect to a shipment to Bolivia, Mr. Justice Sutherland, in discussing the power of the President in foreign affairs, said:

Not only . . . is the Federal power over external affairs in origin and essential character different from that over internal affairs, but participation in the exercise of the power is significantly limited. In this vast external realm, with its important, complicated, delicate, and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation. He makes treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate; but he alone negotiates. Into the field of negotiation the Senate cannot intrude; and Congress itself is powerless to invade it.

The citation is *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation et al.* (299 U. S. 304, 319 (1936)).

I continue the quotation from Hackworth's Digest:

He (the President) negotiates and initiates treaties. Neither the resolutions of Congress nor of the Senate control him in this. If he does not wish to make a treaty, the treaty is not made. If he makes a treaty, it has no binding force upon the United States without the consent of two-thirds of the Senate present and voting. Of course, where a treaty provision requires for its perform-

ance legislative action, as, for instance, the appropriation of money to meet payment agreed to in the treaty, congressional neglect or refusal may defeat the performance of the treaty; but it cannot affect its binding obligation.

Then the Digest goes on to quote from a rather famous statement by Senator Spooner, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Let me inquire what was the citation in reference to the previous statement of Mr. Justice Sutherland which the Senator from Colorado quoted?

Mr. MILLIKIN. United States against Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation et al.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator did not read all the decision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I said I read an excerpt.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt briefly, I should like to say that the decision goes on to say, in substance, that while it is true the President has sole power to negotiate, in so doing he must confine himself within constitutional limitations, or words to that effect.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not challenge that for a moment; I would be among the first, I hope, to argue it. I am simply trying to bring into perspective the relationship of Senate advice to the negotiating power of the President.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I appreciate that; but the Senator did not read the decision in full, and I thought the most important part was left out. That is not the Senator's fault; it is the fault of the man who made the compilation from which the Senator read.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will further yield, I shall read somewhat less than I intended to do:

The President negotiates the treaty, to begin with. He may employ such agencies as he chooses to negotiate the proposed treaty. He may employ the ambassador, if there be one, or a minister or a chargé d'affaires, or he may use a person in private life whom he thinks by his skill or knowledge of the language or people of the country with which he is about to deal is best fitted to negotiate the treaty. He may issue to the agent chosen by him—and neither Congress nor the Senate has any concern as to whom he chooses—such instructions as seem to him wise. He may vary them from day to day. That is his concern. The Senate has no right to demand that he shall unfold to the world or to it, even in executive session, his instructions or the prospect or progress of the negotiation.

I omit some of the text and then read:

The President is so supreme under the Constitution in the matter of treaties, excluding only the Senate's ratification, that he may negotiate a treaty, he may send it to the Senate, it may receive by way of “advice and consent” the unanimous judgment of the Senate that it is in the highest degree

for the public interest, and yet the President is as free when it is sent back to the White House with resolution of ratification attached, to put it in his desk, never again to see the light of day, as he was free to determine in the first instance whether he would or would not negotiate it.

Mr. President, I offer that as a contribution to the effort to bring into perspective the relationship of the advice of the Senate to the President's negotiating powers.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator for his statement. I wish to read into the RECORD at this point the phrase from the Constitution bearing on the question:

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

His power is, of course, limited expressly to being “by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties.” He may negotiate, but the power to make treaties is expressly limited by the phrase “with the advice and consent of the Senate.”

Before this colloquy began I was referring to the obligation resting upon Members of the Senate as public officers, as trustees. The obligation which is placed upon them is more in the nature of the obligation placed on a private citizen who, as a trustee, accepts a trusteeship or other obligation placing upon him the duty to advise and consent with others on important matters of policy. A trustee owes not merely a negative duty but a positive duty to discover and to perform the duties of his trust—not merely the duty to speak or to remain silent as to the details of the trust.

The danger in this whole situation is that the Senate remains so negative in its attitude that it renders little or no service of value to the Nation. The danger is that the Senate shall leave all action to the President at a time when the Senate itself also has a clear duty to act. To my mind it is the positive and inescapable duty of the Senate to advise now both the public and the President of the course that should be followed to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace. The Senate stands as a trustee especially for the men who gave their lives in 1918, and for those who are giving their lives now, so that there may be peace in the world, and so that their children and their children's children may enjoy life, liberty, and the opportunity for the pursuit of happiness. As Senators, we are trustees, and it is our sacred trust to see to it that these men shall not have died in vain. We cannot discharge that trust merely by waiting for the President to act. We cannot discharge that trust by doing little or nothing. We can discharge that trust only by doing all that can be done to secure and maintain a great and lasting peace, a just and lasting peace. In particular, the Senate owes it to these men to do better by them in 1943 than was done by them in 1918. We must provide a better guaranty of peace continuing 25 years from now, than was done by the Senate 25 years ago.

In the field of internal stability within the United States and of regional stability within the Western Hemisphere, the Senate has its usual legislative responsibility and its obligation to investigate conditions with a view to making policies. It does not, however, in this regard act separately from the House of Representatives, nor does it act under any constitutional rule requiring an extraordinary majority. Accordingly, in those fields of internal and regional action while there is need for post-war planning, there is no need for reference to such action in the Senate resolution now pending before us.

In the field of foreign policy, however, insofar as action may be taken by treaty on behalf of the United States, an exceptional situation arises which justifies and will be benefited by an expression of advice by the Senate upon the most vital and fundamental of the considerations involved. To the extent that action shall be taken in our foreign affairs by Executive agreement or by agreement passed upon through an act of Congress, a special Senatorial obligation does not equally arise. In the case, however, of a treaty, a treaty, according to the Constitution, cannot become binding upon the United States unless made by the President and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present. To the extent that our post-war foreign policies are not to be acted upon by treaty, the special obligation for the Senate to give advice therefore does not so clearly arise. It is not clear as to just what conditions make it necessary to proceed by treaty. However, an international agreement through which the peace of substantially the entire world is to be declared, and through which international policies are to be established for the maintenance of that peace for many years to come, apparently would rise to the highest dignity of international agreements and, therefore, would be expected to be in the form of a treaty. It is highly appropriate, therefore, to expect that a treaty on this subject will be submitted to the Senate and that its ratification will depend upon the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present.

The requirement of a two-thirds vote is an extraordinary legislative procedure for determining of any current governmental policy. We should have that in mind as we face this issue, and not be guided by the ordinary safeguards which we place around majority action. We face an unusual legislative responsibility. The difficulty, however, of obtaining a two-thirds favorable vote on any important new and constructive measure is so great that it deserves exceptional and thoughtful consideration on the part of the body which is permitted to act under such a requirement. This requirement was placed in the Constitution when the Senate was to consist originally of 26 Members, and at a time when the bi-party system did not exist and when it was hoped by most of our leaders, including George Washington, that it would not come into existence. The extraordinary character of this rule generally is not now fully appreciated by the public. It is contrary to the general philosophy of

a government which guides its policies by majority vote. It is fundamental in the philosophy of faith in the people and of faith in their elected representatives that the minority shall accept the guidance of the majority when formally stated. It contributes to the stability of a self-governing nation that such nation shall thus accept the leadership of the majority of its people when those people act directly, and shall accept the leadership of the majority of the elected representatives of the people when the people act through their legislature.

A two-thirds rule, however, acts in reverse. It subjects both the majority of the legislative body and the majority of the public, to the rule of the minority of the legislative body, provided only that such minority shall equal one-third plus one of the voting quorum. This rule presents the unusual situation that even though the majority of the public might be convinced that a treaty were definitely in the best interests of the Nation and although a substantial majority of the Senate, together with the President of the United States, were likewise convinced that such a treaty would be for the best interests of the United States; yet, if one-third plus one of the Senators present, voted against it, then the minority would win and the majority of both the Senate and the public would lose. A two-thirds rule, therefore, is in effect not so much a rule by two-thirds as it is a control by one-third plus one.

Whatever may be said for the rule, it puts a premium upon inaction or weak action, for it makes it necessary to obtain a 2-to-1 vote in order to secure any affirmative action.

Accepting this constitutional requirement at its full face value, as we do and should, the responsibility now rests upon the Senate, and particularly upon the majority of the Senate, to see to it that every proposal involving the two-thirds rule is so fully presented to the Senate and to the public that the vote upon it is a vote squarely upon the merits and rises far above all considerations of partisanship, personalities, or prejudices. There is no room, certainly, under a two-thirds rule, for the loss of any vote on the majority side—and I am not speaking of political majorities—for reasons separated from the issue itself. In any contest in which a two-thirds rule is to apply it thus becomes the obligation of the Senate to see to it that any constructive treaty presented is so thoroughly in the interests of the United States of America and of the public as a whole, and is so thoroughly debated and understood, that the public will become so interested in it as to insist upon its approval by the Senate by the constitutional 2-to-1 vote. It becomes doubly important, in a matter of this kind, to make sure that the public understands the issue and understands it soon enough, so that, as the issue finally arises, they will be fully informed.

In the present instance a treaty is not yet before the Senate. In the present instance, therefore, the pending resolution can be validly adopted by a bare majority. The purpose of the pending resolution, however, is to lay the foundation for the subsequent approval of a peace

treaty by a two-thirds vote. The purpose of the pending resolution, therefore, will not be served unless it advances the probability of the approval of such a treaty as will contribute substantially to the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace. If this resolution gives only slight guidance as to the treaty, its advice is of but slight value to the President and to the public. Likewise, it will have served but little in testing the sentiment of the Senate on the probability of securing a two-thirds vote for a certain type of treaty. Therefore, although there is good reason for the adoption of some resolution by the Senate at this time on the question of the post-war foreign policy of this country, this reason disappears in the same proportion as the indefiniteness of the resolution increases. Accordingly, I shall attempt to demonstrate that, although there is need for some resolution of the Senate on this subject at this time, Senate Resolution 192, as introduced, is inadequate to meet that need. I shall also attempt to demonstrate that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida and 13 other Senators adds sufficient definiteness and vitality to the resolution to justify the adoption of the resolution if so amended.

THE RESOLUTION SHOULD MEET CERTAIN TESTS

In order to visualize the tests which a resolution of this kind should pass, I should like to analyze the tests which I believe such resolutions should meet.

The opportunity to adopt a constructive Senate resolution on post-war American foreign policy following this war will come but once. That opportunity is here now. The question is, Do the present resolution and the proposed amendment to it meet the tests that they should meet?

What are the tests that a Senate resolution on post-war American foreign policy should meet at this time? I suggest the following six tests:

First. In substance it should state a robust American policy, expressing the purposes, the ideals, and the best interests of America in establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace in the post-war world in a way that will inspire the confidence of America in that policy.

I believe that the pending resolution, as it stands, does not meet that test as to substance. It does not have sufficient substance to meet the test, as I see it.

Most of these tests are tests of form.

Second. In form, it should outline that policy for later expression in a treaty to be negotiated by the President and to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. It should not imply any authority to make a treaty without such further advice and consent. If it did so, I believe it would go outside its proper scope. I do not believe this resolution fails in that test.

Mr. WHEERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With respect to the two-thirds rule, if the Senate should adopt the Pepper amendment, and the President should perfect a treaty, or take any action which came within the scope of the resolution, would the Senate be in duty bound to ratify the treaty after it was negotiated? If the President should keep within the terms of the resolution, as the Senator has outlined it in substance, and should use his own interpretation in perfecting the treaty, would the Senate be in duty bound to ratify the treaty when it was brought to the Senate for ratification if the treaty were perfected within the provisions of the resolution?

Mr. BURTON. I think the question deserves a little analysis in giving the answer. From the legal, technical point of view, of course, each Senate is legally and technically entitled each time to vote as it sees fit. From the moral point of view, those who were not Members of the Senate at the time the resolution was passed would have a lesser moral obligation to be bound by it than those who were Members of the Senate at the time the resolution was passed. But what is the moral obligation upon which, in international relations, we must substantially stand, and upon which we must rely? It is this, as I see it: To the extent that the President does conform to the things to which we state in the resolution we will consent, as a matter of moral obligation to him, to the country, and to the Allies, we should stand by those points. He may introduce 14 or 15, or some other number of points as to which we have no obligation. On those points we may be unwilling to advise and consent, and therefore may be unwilling to accept the treaty as a whole. Our obligation runs to the specific points which we state, and that is one reason for not stating too many of them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. Mr. BURTON. Continuing with the tests which such a resolution should meet:

Third. In form it should be sufficiently definite to be of substantial help to the President in his negotiation of a treaty and sufficiently general not to handicap his discretion within the scope of the policy.

Fourth. In form it should be sufficiently definite to be of substantial help in clarifying America's post-war policy to the American people and to inspire their confidence in it.

Fifth. In form it should be sufficiently definite to be of substantial help in clarifying America's post-war policy to our allies and to inspire their cooperation with it.

Sixth. Finally, in form it should be sufficiently definite to test the sentiment of the Senate on some substantial point of post-war policy.

II. SENATE RESOLUTION IS INADEQUATE

Turning now to the resolution as pending and as reported to the Senate, I believe that Senate Resolution 192 as it stands is of little value, and fails to meet the need and opportunity of the time.

Senate Resolution 192 as it stands is inadequate. To my mind, it fails to meet

adequately the one test of substance and four of the five tests of form which I have just stated. It is of some little value, but it fails to meet the need and the opportunity of our time. If possible, it should be strengthened.

The senior Senator from Michigan has described it as the lowest common denominator of the views of seven members of the subcommittee of eight that presented it to the standing Committee on Foreign Relations. It did not drop low enough to include the views of the eighth member of the subcommittee because to do so it would have had to drop to zero. He was opposed to any resolution whatever at this time.

The senior Senator from Michigan, by his description of the resolution, has described its weakness. It was reduced to the lowest terms of positive expression that the members could write and still have any resolution. It was reduced to such low terms that in order to gain all seven votes it lost substantially all of its substance. It might have been better to have lost a vote or two in exchange for a paragraph of added substance.

A sounder mathematical simile for the process confronting the Senate would be to seek the highest common factor of positive agreement that can be found in a substantial majority of the Senate, instead of the lowest common denominator to which the views of the Senate can be reduced.

I am hopeful that through this discussion we shall find that there is a substantially higher common factor of positive policy to be found among a substantial majority of the Senate than is found in the original form of Senate Resolution 192. It will be to the interest of America to raise the positive quality of this resolution, and I hope that as thus amended it will command the support of a substantial majority of the Senate.

Based upon the presentation which I have made of the needs of our post-war policy and of the essential spirit of America, I believe that there are two important factors that make up the minimum of that policy if it is to meet the first test of substance which I have prescribed for the resolution. The first test is that it shall state a robust American policy, expressing the purposes, the ideals, and the best interests of America in establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace in the post-war world in a way that will inspire the confidence of America in that policy.

Those two minimum factors, to my mind, are the following:

First. The inclusion in the post-war program of all of the United Nations—large and small—for it is through them all that this war is being won and the post-war peace is to be made possible. As a minimum, we should declare for the unity of the United Nations in peace as well as in war.

Second. The provision for some continuing form of post-war international organization that will be capable of meeting the changing needs of the future.

To leave out either of these two requirements would show a failure to ap-

preciate the sacrifices of some of our allies and of their priceless combined support. To leave out either of these requirements would be to endanger the peace and reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come, which is essential to America's internal stability and to the recovery of our system of private enterprise. To leave out either of these requirements would be to omit from the resolution the spirit of those declarations to mankind which inspired the Declaration of Independence, and which stand today as a beacon light of everlasting faith in God and man that kindles the dream of life, liberty, and the opportunity for the pursuit of happiness in the hearts and minds of every freedom-loving man and woman in the world, wherever and however oppressed he may be. This faith in America is something that we must strengthen rather than destroy.

A study of Senate Resolution 192 shows that it fails to meet the first test of substance, and that it also fails to meet four of my five tests of form.

Senate Resolution 192 is so general as to post-war policy that it does not mean much. This, in fact, strengthens it under the second test of form, because it thereby makes it too general to be used as authority for the President to conclude a treaty without further and more specific consent of the Senate.

In fact, Senate Resolution 192 means in substance little more than a declaration that in the post-war world the United States should join with two or more nations in some international plan to prevent aggression, and to preserve the peace of the world. There is some value in this declaration but it is not worthy of the opportunity now available to the Senate to take the leadership in making sure that the victory we are fighting for shall be made worthy of the price that our people and the other people of the United Nations are paying for it.

Senate Resolution 192, therefore, is to me so general that it can be interpreted as expressing a willingness to accept anything from a Federal Union with two or more nations on one extreme, to a loose military alliance with two or more nations on the other, leaving the choice of intermediate policy substantially as broad in the future as it is now. Between these extremes it leaves ample room for a policy in accordance with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators. It also leaves the road wide open for America to decline to enter into any international organization or any international agreement whatever. There are left open many alternatives. It does not invite in all the United Nations, and it does not declare in favor of joining an international organization to meet the changing needs of the future. What this resolution fails to state is far more important than what it does state.

Similarly Senate Resolution 192 as it stands, fails to meet four of the five tests of form which I have described. The resolution is so general that it can mean anything to anybody. There is little, if anything, in it that it must mean to

everybody. The latter test is the proper test of the effectiveness of legislation.

Senate Resolution 192, therefore, meets my second test and the only one of the six. It is so drawn as to outline the policy it approves in such a general manner that it cannot be interpreted as authorizing the President to bind the United States to any treaty without the further advice and consent of the Senate to such treaty. Personally, however, I do not object to emphasizing this requirement even by the addition of the further amendment proposed by the Junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] which reads as follows:

That any agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall not be binding upon the Government of the United States until a proposal of such agreement shall have been submitted to the United States Senate and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present.

Senate Resolution 192 does not, however, meet any of the remaining four tests which I have defined. It is not sufficiently definite to be of substantial help to the President in his negotiation of a treaty. It is not sufficiently definite, to my mind, to be of substantial help to the American people or to our allies in clarifying America's post-war policy, and it is not sufficiently definite so that a vote upon it can effectively test the sentiment of the Senate on any substantial point of post-war policy.

III. THE AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY SENATOR PEPPER AND OTHERS WOULD MAKE SENATE RESOLUTION 192 ACCEPTABLE

The proposed amendment supplies what is most seriously lacking in the present resolution and is thoroughly consistent with the interests and needs of this country.

The proposed amendment would change the third paragraph of Senate Resolution 192 so that it would read as follows:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted, in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

While this amendment leaves much to be desired it is a substantial improvement over the third paragraph of Senate Resolution 192, which merely reads as follows:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

The proposed amendment would enable Senate Resolution 192, as amended, to meet all the six tests which I have presented.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to know whether the Senator from Ohio is satisfied that the clause beginning in line 5 and ending in line 6 indicates the policy held by the Senate that the President could easily agree upon any form subsequently to be adopted by the Senate, of a judicial tribunal to hear and decide cases and controversies that arise among nations.

Mr. BURTON. I am frank to say to the Senator that it is not as clear and as specific as I should like to have it in that regard; but, just as this amendment varies considerably from the original Senate Resolution 114, we have endeavored to follow language a little broader, and I believe that it is sufficiently broad to include what the Senator suggests. My interpretation would include that authority, but the amendment does not refer to justiciable questions; it does not refer to courts. I will read in a moment from an authoritative statement by Secretary Hull indicating his interpretation of the need at the present time. We are acting in the light of such expressions which would indicate that that certainly is one of the kind of things that should be before us when we say "promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully."

Mr. AUSTIN. I agree that that is very near the minimum that could be said on the subject. If I had doubt that this phrase would include the expression of a policy on our part that we favor the President negotiating, if possible, the establishment of some sort of tribunal that would try out these issues and thus substitute justice for force, I would offer an amendment to it. I wonder if the 14 distinguished Senators would welcome the idea of another Senator proposing an amendment to such a phrase as that?

Mr. BURTON. I cannot speak for the other 14 Senators, but I think it is not a matter of such complexity that it might not be handled in a clear-cut manner by an amendment which would be accepted by them, rather than as a proposal calling for a separate vote. This itself was modified from the form in which it was originally presented to conform with the suggestions made by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and I think, as it stands, it is worthy of support. I think it would be quite appropriate for the Senator from Vermont to suggest to the Senator in charge of the amendment the possibility of accepting a minor modification which would clarify and not limit it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the distinguished Senator from Ohio care to define or express an opinion as to what is meant by the first five words in line 5, "to promote cooperation among nations"? Does that apply only to the peace or does it apply to promoting cooperation from an economic standpoint and from a social standpoint? What is

included in the scope of those five words, if the Senator cares to express an opinion?

Mr. BURTON. Those are general words. I think that perhaps one of the best ways to throw light upon them at the moment would be to read a brief quotation from a speech made by the Secretary of State of the United States, Cordell Hull, on September 12, shortly before this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have that in his speech?

Mr. BURTON. I will put it in now. It was placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] under date of September 14, 1943. The quotation which I read appears at page A4065. Of course, there are other statements in the speech bearing on the point, but this paragraph, I think, may throw light on the particular thought:

Organized international cooperation can be successful only to the extent to which the nations of the world are willing to accept certain fundamental propositions.

First, each nation should maintain a stable government. Each nation should be free to decide for itself the forms and details of its governmental organization—so long as it conducts its affairs in such a way as not to menace the peace and security of other nations.

Second, each nation should conduct its economic affairs in such a way as to promote the most effective utilization of its human and material resources and the greatest practicable measure of economic welfare and social security for all of its citizens. Each nation should be free to decide for itself the forms of its internal economic and social organization—but it should conduct its affairs in such a way as to respect the rights of others and to play its necessary part in a system of sound international economic relations.

Third, each nation should be willing to submit differences arising between it and other nations to processes of peaceful settlement—

I call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the language there used—

Each should be willing to submit differences arising between it and other nations to processes of peaceful settlement, and should be prepared to carry out other obligations that may devolve upon it in an effective system of organized peace.

All of this calls for the creation of a system of international relations based on rules of morality, law, and justice as distinguished from the anarchy of unbridled and discordant nationalisms, economic and political. The outstanding characteristic of such a system is liberty under law for nations as well as individuals. Its method is peaceful cooperation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the statement of Secretary Hull; but is it the answer of the Senator in support of the words in the amendment which I have quoted? Is that as far as they go, or is there any responsibility placed on the United States in this directive to the President not only to cooperate but to give economic and social help to others of the United Nations that are a part of this international organization?

Mr. BURTON. I think that Secretary Hull has stated the case clearly, and I certainly do not enlarge it to the point

of approaching support of the world. I concur in Secretary Hull's statement of the relationship between internal and external relations—both sides of the question—and his words "peaceful cooperation" tie in with the language of the amendment; and, mind you, this language is being considered by the Senate in October in the light of official statements made in September, and placed in the Record of the Senate just before the resolution was submitted to the Senate by the very same Senator who had Secretary Hull's address printed in the Record. I do not mean that he presented the amendment, but he submitted the resolution we are proposing to amend.

Mr. President, I repeat that the proposed amendment, as I see it, would enable Senate Resolution 192, as amended, to meet all the six tests I have presented.

First. The amendment states a robust American policy, expressing the purposes, the ideals, and the best interests of America in establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace in the post-war world in a way that will inspire the confidence of America in that policy.

To be sure, the policy expressed meets little more than the minimum test for such a policy, but nevertheless there is great value in those two minimum features.

The amendment calls for the United States joining with at least all of the United Nations in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to meet the changing needs of the future.

It goes further than this. It provides for including with the United Nations also "such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted." It also provides that such international organization shall be generally available to meet the needs of the times. It provides for the establishment and maintenance of it "to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

This recognition of all the United Nations, and this reference to other nations to be added to them, is a recognition of the rights and aspirations of the small as well as the large nations of the earth. Again I remind the Senate that the United States once was one of the small nations of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I agree with the Senator that all the small nations should have just and fair treatment, but my mind runs back to a debate which occurred in the Senate about 24 years ago, when one of the great issues before this body was the unfair and unjust advantage which one of the great nations would possess, over the United States especially, if the League of Nations covenant were adopted as it was presented. It was argued on the floor of the Senate for days, as one of the reasons why the League of Nations

should be defeated, that one great nation, under the very system the Senator points out in the amendment, would have five votes in the League Assembly, whereas the United States would have only one. The Senator can readily understand that such an argument, that one nation in the League would have five votes, because it had five different subgovernments, so to speak, such as Australia and other dominions, would bring on contention. It did cause contention, and was one of the factors which brought about the defeat of the League of Nations. I am making this statement although I was a very earnest advocate of the League of Nations, and worked very strenuously and vigorously to have the League of Nations agreed to by this body. But one of the reasons for its defeat was a provision in the League covenant identical with that which the Senator now wants to insert in the proposal he is sponsoring. In other words, if we are to treat dominions as independent governments, naturally we will have the same argument again.

It has been a long time since I have read the debates of that former day; I have not looked at them lately, but my recollection is that it was argued on this floor that if we were going to allow one member of the League to have a vote for each dominion, why was not the United States entitled to have a separate vote for a great State, such as the State of New York, or the great State of Pennsylvania, or the great State of Texas, or the great State of Florida, whose interests might be somewhat different? I am not taking a stand against the dominions which would have been granted votes. I think Australia is a wonderful country, and, whether it is or not, it deserves to be a free and independent government. That is my own view about the matter. Our neighbor to the north, Canada, is in a somewhat similar position. But if the Senator's amendment is to bring up for discussion, when the treaty comes before the Senate, the same subject which was raised 24 years ago, and which was so strenuously and vigorously fought over, and which in part helped defeat the League of Nations, why insert it before we even have a peace treaty before us?

Mr. BURTON. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee; it should not be inserted, and it is not inserted. It would be far from my desire to insert it or to insert the implication of it. What I read to the Senator is this, in the amendment:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted, in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization.

Nothing is said about the form it would take, and nothing is intended to be said about the form it would take.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator read again about the free nations?

Mr. BURTON. It reads:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted.

Mr. McKELLAR. "Such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted." Why is that language used? When we say "sovereign nations," that is all-inclusive. Why add the additional language, if it is not intended, or if it does not have the possibility, to raise the very question which aided greatly in the defeat of the League of Nations?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I shall yield in a moment. Before the Senator from Tennessee leaves the point as to what may be possible, it is just as possible to present any kind of argument bearing on that kind of a question under the original resolution as it would be under the resolution as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true, but we do not commit ourselves to it.

Mr. BURTON. Neither do we under the amendment, I point out to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why use the language if there is not committal in it? Why use that language? Why use that surplusage? It is said in the very outset that the sovereign nations are included. Why talk about independent nations after that?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was very much interested in the comment and the inquiry of the able Senator from Tennessee. I thought perhaps that from his memory of the League of Nations contest in the Senate he might perhaps refer to the understanding I have, that President Wilson and the other proponents of the League repeatedly asserted that the argument of equality of vote, which pertained to the Assembly of the League, was not applicable to the governing body of the League, which was the Council, and that it was an exaggerated argument even when it was made in those days, and made by the opponents of the League, who were looking for almost any kind of an argument to hurl against the institution which Woodrow Wilson proposed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, indeed, the Senator is exactly correct, but it raised the question, it gave room for argument, just as this provision will give room for argument in the future. It gave room for the argument which was made. President Wilson did take the position the Senator has stated.

I cannot say offhand, but I am quite sure my good friend Jim Reed, then a Senator from Missouri, who was one of the greatest orators and one of the greatest debaters ever to serve in this body, at least since I have been a Member of it, a wonderful speaker, used that argument not once, but many times, and men such as the brilliant Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, the gifted Philander C. Knox, the eloquent William E. Borah, and Hiram W. Johnson, of California, one of the most eloquent, persuasive,

dramatic, and forceful debaters in the Senate at that time, and still a powerful and outstanding figure in this body, as well as other Senators, who were fighting the League, used it to the very limit. I do not want anything to go into the pending resolution which would give rise to any such possibility when we come to passing upon the peace terms. What we want to do, in my opinion, is to obtain a peace treaty which will prevent future wars. As I stated yesterday, that is the only thing the United States is fighting for, the prevention of future wars. We have no other interest in this great war now being waged in the world. We do not want the territory of any other nation; we do not want the domain of any other nation; we do not want the property of any other nation; all we want is to be allowed to live in peace with the rest of the world, and we want to guarantee that peace, and in my judgment that is all that need be said at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As the able Senator from Ohio has pointed out, the amendment of the group of which the able Senator is a member proposes only that the nations which shall compose the organization be those specified in the amendment, but the way they shall vote, the number of votes that each shall have, is not specified or provided for in the amendment which is being advocated by the Senator from Ohio. One might just as well say that the United States Senate should not agree to Senate Resolution 192 because it says all free and sovereign nations shall constitute the membership of the authority envisaged by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, because that means that Costa Rica, which is a free and sovereign nation, shall have the same vote and the same influence and the same power in the international authority that the United States of America, or Russia, or the United Kingdom would have. I use Costa Rica only by way of illustration, because it is a much smaller country in population and in national wealth and in area than the United States of America; and I can well imagine what Senator Reed and what Senator Borah and what Senator Knox would have said, and what whoever may be their counterparts in the next League of Nations debate would say about a proposal to the effect that the United States of America, with 130,000,000 people, which is going to have to bear a considerable part of the responsibility for maintaining this organization, shall have no more strength and influence and power in it than our fine neighbor, for example, Costa Rica, in Central America.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Florida. Let me say that I think the amendment raises no greater difficulty on that point than the resolution itself. The fact is inherent in world affairs today. We ought to meet the situation as constructively as our forefathers did in dealing with New York, Virginia, or Connecticut when framing the Constitution, and I believe that we should

leave the field of the mechanics to negotiation at a later date.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me? Because of the very able and enlightening address being made by him, I am very reluctant to interrupt him.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I have been warned to conclude because another Senator is to follow me and his statement will bear on another matter. I shall yield, however, but I hope the Senator may be brief.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope my question will not entail a long answer. I do not want to be technical or meticulous, but it seems to me that the whole debate is largely centered and hangs on words. I wonder what, if any, significance the Senator attaches to these words? In Senate resolution 192 we find the words "with power to prevent aggression." In the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and his distinguished associates, we find instead of "to prevent" the words "to suppress." In the debate yesterday there was brought out in explanation of the word "suppress" the example of the break in the dike in which the boy placed his hand to suppress the flow of water, thereby saving the dike. Another example given was the suppressing of small fires.

In my opinion, what we need in a resolution of this kind, and what we should accomplish by a subsequent treaty, is not a situation which allows military aggression to get under way before intervention by international authority, but intervention before such military aggression gets started. So in my opinion the words "to prevent aggression" are much stronger than the words "to suppress." In other words I refer to the old saying that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" or in the case of the amendment "a pound of suppression."

I wonder if the Senator has an explanation of those words, "to prevent aggression," and whether he agrees with me that the word "suppress" always refers to an existing condition? In other words you cannot suppress a thing until it actually exists. On the other hand, if action is taken in time, you can prevent the objectionable thing from coming into existence.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, replying to the able Senator from Utah, my thought would be that the natural interpretation and the primary interpretation of the word "suppress" is precisely what he gives to it. "Military force, to suppress military aggression" would be clearly applicable to the suppression of military aggression already under way. The reason for including that language is that we thought it vital that the force be such that it can suppress aggression when it is small, it can act upon it after it is growing—it can go all the way. Whereas the word "prevent" might very well exclude such action, for by the language of the resolution itself not even military aggression is proposed to be suppressed. It would not justify anything more than the exercise of the power of persuasion or power of eco-

nomic sanction, whatever power it may be to prevent something from taking place, the power named in the Kellogg Pact. In order to meet the serious situation resulting from the initiation of military aggression we have inserted the language we consider necessary in the amendment, and coupled with it are the words "and to preserve the peace of the world." We think that language is adequate to cover the requirements we deem necessary.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly again?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot agree with the Senator's explanation but I shall not prolong the argument on that point. I should like to call his attention, however, to one point. I do so because of a question asked by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] with reference to the possibility under the amendment of cooperation between nations in the economy of the world or in economic questions. We find in the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and his associates, including the able Senator from Ohio, this language, "to suppress military aggression." From past experience I can conceive of economic aggression on the part of a nation such as Germany, including future attempts at infiltration of nazi-ism in the South American countries, for example, for the very purposes of economic aggression. I think that such type of economic aggression, so objectionable in a world that wants peace, is included and could be prevented under Senate Resolution 192, whereas in the amendment which the Senator is sponsoring the only aggression to be suppressed is military aggression. So, in my opinion, as one very humble Member of the Senate, it seems to me the language of Senate Resolution 192, both with reference to military aspects and also to economic aspects, is in much more definite and much stronger terms than the amendment which is sponsored by the able Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I respond to the question of the Senator from Utah and disagree with his interpretation, for the reason that I will endeavor to explain. It seems to me that the language of the amendment bearing on this feature is far preferable and more adapted to the proprieties of the situation than is the original language. In the first place, there rises the question of suppressing military aggression. It is of vital importance that there be military force available on the part of the United Nations to suppress military aggression. The great danger which we faced at the beginning of this war resulted from our lack of available military force, and that situation, I believe, is met clearly in the amendment but not in the resolution.

It seems to me that we should not need to employ military force to suppress economic aggression. We must meet economic aggression with ample power, whatever it may be. The language in the amendment is "and with power"—of all kinds; the same kind of power provided for in the resolution—with

power of all kinds, and, to avoid misconception, we use the words "including military force," and "to suppress military aggression"; and finally, "and to preserve the peace of the world." We provide full power to preserve the peace of the world on the economic aggression side.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is not the Senator criticizing Senate Resolution 192 with reference to prevention of military aggression because of the fact that military force is not stated specifically in the resolution? Then he reads into Senate Resolution 192, referring to the aspect of economic aggression, that it might be construed that we could stop that by military force. In my opinion such criticism of Senate Resolution 192 is hardly justified. A fair construction of the resolution, in my opinion, is that any power that is made available by international authority which may be organized, is there ready, whether it be military power or economic sanctions, or what not, not only to stop unfair but let us say dangerously ambitious economic aggression, and it also includes military power, if necessary, to prevent military aggression before it gets under way. For instance, suppose after the treaty is completed we find some nation, secretly and under all the cover that is possible, building up her military power. Under Senate Resolution 192, in my opinion, the international authority could intervene at that point, before that nation got under way with her military aggression, and could say to her, "Here! You are building up military power in violation of world peace, and we want you to stop it, and under this international authority we will stop it."

But as I understand the Senator's amendment, the military aggression must get under way, it must be moving, it must be actually in existence, before the power about which he talks can step in and "suppress" it.

Mr. BURTON. I think the Senator from Utah misunderstands the language, and does not interpret it in accordance with its clear meaning. The language of Senate Resolution 192 as it stands is limiting language or has the grave danger of limitation because it is not specific on the question of the use of military force to suppress military aggression. There is a great temptation in time of need to avoid the use of it, as occurred at the beginning of the present war.

But if the Senator will read the language of the amendment, certainly the word "power"—the same word which is in the original resolution—is in the amendment, and the effect of "power, including military force," certainly is not less than that of "power," as it stands, without the additional words "including military force."

Therefore, there would be "power, including military force"; in addition to the word "power," which was in the original resolution, there would be added specifications and we would add the words "to

suppress military aggression," so as to make clear that it covers that point, and the words "and to preserve the peace of the world" cover that generality.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to be sure that the interpretation the Senator from Utah has just placed upon Senate Resolution 192 is a proper one, and I think the authors of the resolution may also be interested.

Mr. MURDOCK. They are not responsible for my interpretation.

Mr. HATCH. I understand, but the Senator is an able lawyer and has a keen mind and the interpretation he places upon the resolution is entitled to consideration. I simply want to be sure that I correctly understood the Senator. Does the Senator interpret the words of Senate Resolution 192 "with power to prevent aggression" as meaning that under that language military power could be used to prevent military aggression, political aggression, or any kind of aggression whatever? Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, my answer is that Senate Resolution 192 is not limited or qualified as to what power can be used, either to prevent unfair economic aggression or military aggression.

Mr. HATCH. Then I am correct in understanding that under the Senator's interpretation military power could be used, as he said, to prevent too ambitious economic aggression.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it would be possible under this resolution, in preventing dangerously ambitious economic aggression, to resort to military force, but the possibility in my opinion is very remote.

Mr. HATCH. I assure the Senator that that interpretation has never before been given to the resolution, either by its authors or by other Senators. That is the reason why I am interested.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, I make that interpretation on my own responsibility; but in doing so I want to add that in my opinion, the time will never come when military force will be necessary in order to prevent economic aggression; but the time will come, in my opinion, when economic power, such as economic sanctions, will be wholly necessary to stop unfair and dangerously aggressive economic practices by one country in another. I do not think the time will ever come when the use of the military will be necessary for the suppression of economic aggression.

Mr. HATCH. But it could come.

Mr. MURDOCK. But even if the time should come when the international authority thought it wise and prudent in maintaining the peace of the world, it could, if necessary, stop unfair and dangerous economic aggression by military power. Let me call the attention of the able Senator to the fact that there are few of the wars of history that are not traceable to economic ambitions or injustices. Therefore, if economic ambition and injustice cause war, such eco-

nomie aggression as is likely to cause war should be stopped, even if resort to military force by international authority is necessary.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to ask these questions. I should like to ask one other question of the Senator before concluding, if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. BURTON. I yield, but again I state to the Senator from Utah that I am under obligation to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to conclude my remarks so as to enable him to proceed. I should like to conclude my remarks as soon as I possibly can.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall refrain, from now on, from interrupting the Senator; but at this time I should like to have him tell me whether by the use of the word "suppress" he means that the military aggression must be under way and must be on the move before, under this amendment, we could step in and prevent it.

Mr. BURTON. As I stated a little while ago, that is the natural and primary meaning of the word "suppress." I believe it can be expanded to a broader meaning, but I do not rely upon the expansion to a broader meaning. I rely upon the effect of the words "with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." I believe those words amply meet the necessity.

Mr. President, from now on I shall proceed with my remarks. Being under compulsion to conclude my remarks soon, I shall decline to yield further, although I appreciate the importance and materiality of the points which have been made by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator has been very generous, and I thank him very much, indeed.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this recognition of all of the United Nations, and this reference to other nations to be added to them, is a recognition of the rights and aspirations of the small as well as of the large nations of the world. It is an expression of America's traditional interest in the welfare of all human beings and in their inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It also is a recognition of the vital, practical importance to America of the continuance of world-wide peace with a reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come. It is a recognition of the need for preserving the unity of the United Nations in peace as well as in war, both from the point of view of military force and otherwise.

This amendment meets the second test in the same manner as does the original resolution. Its definition of policies is not carried to such an extreme that such definition could possibly be interpreted as a consent to some treaty that is as yet unseen and unwritten, and thereby could authorize, by any extension of authority, its final determination by the President without returning it to the Senate. Here again, however, the addition of the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Indiana might well,

to my mind, still further emphasize the appropriate intent of the Senate.

The Pepper amendment, by its definiteness on the points mentioned, enables Senate Resolution 192 to meet each of my remaining four tests of acceptability. The amendment is definite where the original resolution is not. Yet this definiteness is so limited to fundamentals that it cannot handicap the appropriate discretion of the President in negotiating a treaty, and it will strengthen his hands in every international relationship he may experience.

I believe it will be helpful, in consideration of the phrase "such free and sovereign nations" and the need and propriety of including in the resolution the phrase "all the United Nations," to made reference to the extraordinarily able and clear speech of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], delivered on August 27, in Texas. The speech is printed at page A3770 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I refer particularly to the following quotation:

So long as the nations imposing the peace shall be ready and willing to maintain that peace by the last argument of military force, it will live. The United Nations must, when our enemies are mastered, establish an international agency to determine disputes over boundaries, over all the quarrels that lead to international war and to arrest aggression and criminal conquest.

Such an agency, unless invested with power to enforce its decisions, cannot survive. It must have authority to call upon member nations for troops and navies, when necessary, to enforce its decrees and impose upon aggressors and violators of the law of nations punishment for their crimes.

Then the Senator from Texas, illustrative of his convictions in this matter, pointed out the following:

From our commanding point of vantage we must declare to the world that our influence and our might will be dedicated to the maintenance of world peace and the suppression of military aggression whenever it may lift its venomous head. The United States must be a member of the peace agency. Without that membership it will fail. Russia must be a party. * * * Great Britain must be a member. Great old China must have a seat. * * * Other members of the United Nations must have a place at the council table.

Again:

The Senate of the United States will at an early date consider a resolution expressing the desire of the United States to join in the establishment of a world peace agency to curb international bandits and robbers and to preserve the peace of the world. Such an agency does not necessarily imply that world conditions will be frozen.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for giving prominence and prestige to the remarks of the Senator from Texas. I rise only to inquire whether or not he takes any issue with what I said.

Mr. BURTON. I agree thoroughly with those remarks; and I wish to point out, as I am sure the Senator realizes, that in our advocacy of those remarks in this proposed amendment we are really

endeavoring, I believe, to carry out the conviction of the Senator from Texas, which he evidently was forced to yield in the course of reaching a compromise on this resolution. I believe the Senate can well come to his rescue in that regard and put him in a position where, on the final vote, he may be able to vote for his original convictions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator again for giving prominence to my remarks. He implies that the Senator from Texas was forced to do something. The Senator from Texas has views, but he does not have all the views in the world. He is not so stubborn or arbitrary as not to go along because his exact language is not adopted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am delighted to hear this expression from the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure that he will not again say that this resolution must not be amended.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to engage in any flippant argument with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico is not being flippant.

Mr. CONNALLY. I referred to his argument, not to him.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I did not wish to imply that the Senator from Texas had been forced. I did wish to imply that he had yielded his best judgment to the compromise. I am sure that his conviction is what it originally was; and if others can save him from the necessity of yielding at this point, I am sure that in the final analysis he will welcome with enthusiasm his original position if it is supported by the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree with the construction which the Senator places upon the present situation. I have nothing to retract from what I said. Those have been my views for 25 years or longer. I am not a new convert. I am not laboring under any fantastic illusion that my particular language or my particular words ought to be adopted in legislation. My conviction is that everything I said in that speech can be accomplished properly, legally, and constitutionally under the language of Senate Resolution 192 as presented to the Senate. I have surrendered nothing of principle. I may have surrendered phraseology. We may have taken out an "an". We may have used the word "authority" instead of "organization" on the theory that "authority" is broader than "organization." We used the word "authority" because it was broad enough to cover the utilization of the World Court, the League of Nations, if necessary or practicable, and The Hague Conventions; and broad enough to cover a further authorization to create a new and additional organization to effectuate

the broad objectives of preventing aggression with power.

What is power? Let us look to the lexicographers, and not to the perfervid oratory of Senators. What does the dictionary say? Power includes mental power. There is the World Court, and there are other agencies for discussing and settling problems by mental processes. Power includes moral power. It includes physical power. Everyone knows what physical power is. It is a sword, a cannon, a piece of artillery, or a navy.

What is desired beyond this broad authorization? We are not agreeing in advance to ratify any treaty which may be brought back, but we are saying to the world, "We are willing to cooperate with-in this broad field." We are saying to the President, "This is our attitude, and this is our advice." After all, the President is the man who is going to make the treaty. Are the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] so afraid of their President that they must instruct him in the minutiae? Must we tell him where to put a comma and where to put a period? Shall we say to the President, "We are advising you, and if you do not use this language, we will not stand by you"?

Mr. BURTON. Treating the remarks of the Senator from Texas on August 27 in a purely objective manner, and referring to it merely as language, I wish to point out that the language which he used at that time has been omitted from Senate Resolution 192, and is proposed to be reinserted by the amendment which we are supporting. I believe that from the point of view of the Secretary of State, in his present negotiations, for example, seeking clarification of the point of view of the United States Senate, he will find greater help if the advice of the Senate can be put in the language in which it was put by him on September 12, in which it was put by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on August 27, and in which it is put in the proposed amendment, rather than in the language of the original resolution.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude with emphasis on the fact that it is vitally important to adopt immediately, by a substantial vote, in accordance with constitutional processes, the resolution as proposed to be amended.

IV. IT IS VITALLY IMPORTANT TO ADOPT IMMEDIATELY BY A SUBSTANTIAL VOTE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES, THE RESOLUTION AS THUS AMENDED

When General MacArthur was welcomed to Australia he included in his response the following statement:

I have come as a soldier in a great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die, and to this end I pledge you the full resources of all the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen.

That is the spirit on the front line. There is no question that the men on the front line are doing their share. It is for us to live up to their standard and to our responsibility to them. Our first duty is

to help in every way we can to win the war. Senate Resolution 192, amended as proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in the name of himself and 13 other Senators, would tend both to unite our Nation and to unite our allies. Our great obligation, next to winning the war, is to make sure that when the war is won it will stay won. This amended resolution would help to that end. We must do everything in our power to make sure that we shall establish, following the war, internal stability in this Nation for the benefit of its people. The opportunity to do so will have been won jointly by all who have fought this war to victory. Full success, however, will depend upon the establishment of peace with a reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come. It is only thus that we shall have a peace worthy of the infinite price paid for it. It is through such a determination to establish and to maintain peace as is expressed in the resolution as proposed to be amended that we can establish a national policy worthy of those who are fighting this war and worthy of those who established this Nation.

We shall live up to the destiny of this Nation if, but only if, we have that deep faith in God and in man which makes us willing to maintain in peace as well as in war that high devotion to this Nation that has won and preserved its freedom. To paraphrase General MacArthur's noble statement: "We are engaged in the great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die and to this end we pledge the full resources of all the mighty power of our country and all the blood of our countrymen."

This is too deep a dedication for us to falter in carrying out our share in it. It is for us, through our efforts to establish and maintain the peace of the world, to see to it that our young men and women who shall come back from the war shall find here the America of lasting peace, assured stability, high ideals, and high opportunity of which they think, of which they dream, and for which they fight.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL ON HIS VISIT TO WAR FRONTS

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I happen to know that many Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle are very much interested in hearing the address which the Senator from Georgia is about to begin, and I hope he will yield to me in order that I may make the point of no quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the statement of the Senator from Alabama, I will yield, but I may say that my remarks will largely be a repetition of my statement in the Senate on October 7 last.

Mr. HILL. I can assure the Senator that many Senators are anxious to hear his address. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	Raddcliffe
Andrews	Gerry	Reed
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scrugham
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, published reports of statements purporting to have been made in secret sessions of the Senate by individual members of the Senate committee which recently visited the war theaters overseas have been the subject of much criticism and comment in recent weeks.

The summary of the findings of the committee as a body, outlining opinions on which all of the Senators who participated in the trip were in complete agreement, was given to the press and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Very little has been said or published about those conclusions. Perhaps they were not spectacular enough.

The fragmentary handling by the press of the reporting by some Senator or Senators who saw fit to disregard the rules of the Senate applying secrecy to executive sessions caused a great deal of confusion and distortion in the accounts of what transpired appearing in the press and given over the radio. There seems to be a natural tendency on the part of most human beings to emphasize critical statements and gloss over those which are commendatory in character.

The widespread publicity given the deliberations of a secret session reflects no credit on the Senate. It will probably be a long time before another executive session is held. It does seem that a Member or Members of this body who cannot resist the impulse to report secret proceedings to newsmen would at least make an attempt to present a more complete picture. It may well be that it was unwise to arrange an executive session in the first instance. I personally had no objection to making a general statement of my views and observations in public, but it was felt that an executive session would enable the members of the committee to speak more freely on such matters as the number of troops and amount of equipment in each area, and other plans and details of the war which

it would be against the public interest to make available to our enemies.

I believed that if the expedition were to prove of any value to the Senate and thereby to the country in dealing with war legislation or post-war problems, I should be perfectly frank in making my report. Nothing was further from my purpose than to engender any bitterness, either at home or between us and our allies, which would in the slightest degree adversely affect our united effort in the great struggle for life and freedom in which we are all engaged, and I have no apologies for any statement that I made.

In view of the fragmentary and somewhat garbled reports which have been circulated and discussed, I have decided, in order to clear the atmosphere and make plain my own views, to make in open session of the Senate the same report, insofar as possible, I made in the executive session. I have omitted only facts which might be valuable to our enemies. During the course of the sessions a number of questions were asked, and I, of course, cannot remember all of them or repeat my answers verbatim. I am, however, using the same notes and manuscript to which I referred in the executive session held October 7. I do not expect my colleagues to welcome the opportunity to hear the same statement twice, but I feel that in justice to myself I should repeat it. If any Member of the Senate desires to repeat the questions asked in the executive sessions I shall endeavor to answer them just as I did in the first place, if my memory will permit.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I am not undertaking to speak for the committee. This is not a committee report in any sense of the word. It is a statement of my own individual views. As is natural in such a case, each individual Senator who went on the trip returned with some ideas and opinions that differed from those held by his colleagues. All of us did not see and hear the same things, and there were instances of different constructions being placed upon what we did see and hear. Despite the fact that practically every statement made by any member of the committee is attributed to "the five Senators," there are a number of matters on which we are not in agreement.

I now pass, Mr. President, to the manuscript which I used on October 7.

It may facilitate an understanding of the reports of the members of the committee designated to visit the American war operations overseas to preface the discussion with a brief outline of the route traveled by the committee in the course of its investigation.

Leaving Washington on July 25, we flew via Presque Isle, Maine, to an air base in Newfoundland, and from there we proceeded to another airfield in Labrador.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will not the Senator bring the map to which he is now referring from the corner of the Chamber to the front, so that we all may

understand him better, as we would like to do?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was only prepared to use the map to describe the course of the trip of the committee, and that will occupy only a short time. I shall be happy to have the map moved, however, if the Senator desires, but it is a rather large map.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest that it be moved down to the front.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

[The map was moved to the Well of the Senate in front of the desk.]

Mr. RUSSELL. I repeat, leaving Washington on July 25, we flew to Presque Isle, Maine, and from there to a large air base in Newfoundland. From this field in Newfoundland [indicating on map] we proceeded to another large base in Labrador used by planes flying across the Atlantic for delivery to England. From this field in Labrador [indicating] we flew across the awesome ice cap, and peaks and glaciers of Greenland, following the Great Circle route to a field in Iceland [indicating]. From Iceland we went to the United Kingdom, where we spent a number of days, practically half the time with our Eighth Air Force. From a gigantic airport in southwest England we took off at midnight one night for Marrakech, in north Africa [indicating].

We spent more than a week in the north African theater of operations, and visited all the important cities along the Mediterranean, as well as Casablanca on the Atlantic, and all the troop concentrations that are scattered along the entire rim of north Africa, as well as the scene of the fighting there last spring. Leaving Cairo, we traveled across Arabia to Basra and Abadan [indicating] on the Persian Gulf. There, in a climate so hot that the actual temperature recorded by thermometer defies belief, our men are assembling and delivering to the Russians vast quantities of war matériel under lend-lease.

From this theater we proceeded to Karachi, in India [indicating], and thence across India by New Delhi and Assam Province and over the Burma Hump into China, visiting Kunming and Chungking. Coming back out of China we proceeded to Calcutta, and from Calcutta across the Bay of Bengal to Ceylon. From Ceylon we crossed the Indian Ocean to Carnarvon on the west coast of Australia. We were told that ours was the first land plane ever to make this flight across the Indian Ocean. We visited Port Darwin and Townsville, from which place we flew across the Coral Sea to General MacArthur's headquarters in New Guinea. Returning to Australia we landed at Brisbane, from which city, after a visit to Sydney and Melbourne, we took off for New Caledonia. We came home across the Pacific, stopping at Fiji Islands, Samoa, Christmas Island, and Hawaii on our way to Los Angeles, whence we took the last long jump across the entire United States to Washington.

This represents the route taken by the four-motored Liberator transport in which we left Washington. The party did not stay together throughout the en-

tire trip, but went to different places within each area visited in other planes. The large plane in which we left Washington flew nearly 37,000 miles, and members of the committee traveled several thousand miles in other planes when visiting points where a four-motored plane could not land. About one-eighth of the total time of the trip was consumed in travel through the air. Most of the remaining seven-eighths was spent in an earnest effort to gather information.

Upon my appointment as chairman of the committee I announced that we were in no sense a committee on the conduct of the war, and that I did not consider it within our province to undertake to advise or interfere with Allied military and naval leaders in their direction of the strategy of the war. I did feel that the committee could perform a very useful function for the Senate by securing first-hand information from the various theaters of operations as to the provisions being made for the health and well-being of our troops, as well as finding out what the men were thinking and talking about, the condition of their morale, the suitability of the tools of war being produced at such great effort and expense, and the general effectiveness with which the war is being prosecuted. I also believed that the things heard and observed by such a Senate committee would be helpful in dealing with the questions arising from our relations with the other Allied powers, and in preparing for the many twyng and complex issues whose solution must have final approval by the Senate after the war is over.

No one would claim that any person could become conversant with all phases of our far-flung activities in a trip of little more than two months' duration. All that one could hope to do was to get a fair idea of the general atmosphere prevailing in each of the theaters visited. This we endeavored to do by personal contact and observation. We slept in palaces and in pup tents. We ate with those who are directing the destinies of nations, and with enlisted men at their mess. We conferred with high officials of every government visited, as well as with the commanding officers in every theater of operations. We had explanations of strategy, tactics, and objectives, illustrated by maps and in some cases by moving pictures. We talked to wounded men in hospitals who had just been brought in from the front, as well as with men of all ranks belonging to every branch of the service.

We spent days with the Fifth Army as they were undergoing the final phases of intensive training in amphibious operations preparatory to the invasion of Italy, as well as with Commando units and Marines training for jungle fighting in the South Pacific. We saw bomber and fighter squadrons briefed for attack take off in their planes, both from England and in the Pacific theater. We visited men in their barracks, and chatted with them as they relaxed in Red Cross canteens. We attended the moving-picture and the U. S. O. shows, to which the men in the more remote places look forward so avidly.

The men who are actually fighting this war are thinking about post-war problems, as well as things at home and the conduct of the war. I wish that every Member of the Senate could have been with me to share my discomfort during a two-hour grilling by several hundred Servicemen in a Red Cross canteen in New Delhi, which they have named "Duration Den." It would have required not only all the powers of prophecy of the entire Senate, but full and frank replies from the heads of all the Allied powers to answer some of the questions propounded. Any idea that the men are only thinking about the end of the war and getting home would be disabused by a visit to any overseas station.

What I have seen and heard does not make me an expert on all things pertaining to the war, but I have a much clearer picture than I could possibly have gained by zealous attendance on committee hearings for 12 months. Not only is this war the greatest undertaking the American people have ever embarked upon, but even after having visited all the theaters of operations it is difficult to grasp the magnitude of the job to which the power and might of the United States and our allies have been harnessed all around the globe. It was a great experience to see first-hand the difficulties and obstacles which are requiring such a tremendous expenditure of human energy and material resources, and which demand ingenuity, heroism, and a spirit of sacrifice on the part of millions of our boys and girls.

The over-all problem of transportation involved in this war is so great as to stagger the imagination. It taxes to the limit the resources of our Nation and the human endurance of our people engaged in it. The most striking single difficulty is that involved in the effort to supply our forces in China and our Chinese allies. After having been brought thousands of miles by steamship into the harbor of Calcutta, every pound of supplies going to General Chennault's gallant air forces in China must now be loaded or unloaded nine different times, as well as being flown over the towering peaks of the Burma "hump" before they can be utilized against the enemy.

The job of maintenance and repair in this mechanized war is an onerous one. Veritable factories must follow each army. American engineers and mechanics have built great machine shops at various places across the vast reaches of north Africa, on the scorching rim of the Persian Gulf, in Australia, and on the islands of the South Pacific, where planes, tanks, trucks, and ships are either assembled or repaired. I never ceased to marvel at their efficiency. We saw production lines at these remote stations receive airplane engines that seemed to be completely wrecked. A few hours later they emerged wrapped in cellophane, and as precisely tooled and efficient as a new engine coming from a plant in the United States.

One benefit we will derive from the enormous expenditures of this awful war lies in the training of large numbers of the finest craftsmen and mechanics in

the world. Both the Army and the Navy have accomplished wonders in this respect. Boys who 12 months ago were either unemployed or doing work requiring no skill are today repairing the most delicate instruments, such as radar and radio equipment, telephone exchanges, submarine periscopes, and are working with the countless finely balanced machines which are necessary in the operation of airplanes, submarines, and other complicated mechanisms of war.

Every American may well be proud of the manner in which our armed forces have met the problem of maintenance and supply. Our difficulties have been so far solved that our troops are now unquestionably the best fed, best equipped, and best provided armed forces the world has ever seen. In some of the remote areas the ration is not as tasty and varied as one would like, but all of our men have plenty of nourishing food and clothes adapted to the climate in which they serve and fight.

The completeness of the hospital facilities both in the field and at permanent stations, and the speed with which the sick and wounded receive treatment are almost unbelievable. I do not think we failed to visit a hospital at a single place we stopped, and I talked with doctors, nurses, and patients. Men are recovering from wounds in a few weeks in this war which would have proved fatal heretofore, and the use of the sulfa drug, blood plasma, and new methods of treatment are accomplishing miracles. Most of these hospital units moved to the front completely staffed with doctors and nurses from our leading hospitals in the States. The quality of medical treatment received by the sick and wounded in our armed forces is incomparably superior to the average treatment received by the civilian population at home.

All Senators have talked to eyewitnesses who have vividly portrayed some of the difficulties and obstacles with which our fighting men must contend in the course of operations, as well as the indomitable courage and resourcefulness of our boys who are engaged in actual combat. I shall not repeat them. All of us heard sagas of individual heroism and accomplishment which make the stories of the Knights of the Round Table pale in comparison. It was hard to believe that the quiet and modest chap you met in a hospital cheerfully bearing three or four gaping wounds was a hero who had either killed 11 Japs single-handed or had flown through the hell of fire which greeted the men who struck the Ploesti oil refineries. I shall never forget the emotions I experienced as I sat with 50 fighter pilots of the Eighth Air Force in England and heard a handsome blond squadron leader about 25 years old instruct his men on a mission across the Channel. He sounded as casual as if he were discussing the proper play to run in a football game. Nor can I forget the fine-looking boy, a veteran of 6 months' jungle fighting at 19, who 12 hours before had received a bullet in his leg while fighting the Japs in the Solomons. It so happened that I knew

his family quite well. He was more interested in talking about conditions in Georgia than in New Georgia. After telling me that he hoped to be back in action within 3 weeks, he wound up by expressing concern about the people back home, saying: "Look after the folks at home, Senator, and we will take care of these Japs out here."

The fighting in Europe is against a determined, well-equipped, and resourceful enemy. It does more or less follow the orthodox conception of war. The war in the Pacific is a battle to the death. Tales of incredible and shocking brutality by the Japanese in the treatment of our men, including the wounded, make it easy to understand why no quarter is now being asked or given. The Japs had the early advantage of training in jungle fighting. They are patient and cunning. A Japanese sniper will tie himself in a tree and remain there for 3 or 4 days. Another will spend several hours crawling as short a distance as a hundred yards for a shot at an American soldier or marine. They have a great trick of slipping behind our lines and feigning death along a path on which reinforcements must travel and throwing a grenade into a detachment of our men. They had mastered all the arts of camouflage in jungle fighting. The best illustration I can use to describe the jungle fighting in the islands of the South Pacific is to compare it with Indian warfare in early colonial days, with the jungle more fearsome and difficult to penetrate than any primeval forest.

Our men have had to learn jungle fighting the hard way, but they have finally mastered it, and today they are beating the Jap at his own game.

NAVAL OPERATIONS

As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee I undertook to observe as many of the activities of our Navy in the areas visited as possible. I am frank to say that I believe the Navy is doing a disservice to many American heroes by overstressing its policy of remaining the "silent service." Sailors handled every one of the landing barges which took the troops and Marines ashore in the South Pacific, as they did in north Africa, in Sicily, and in Italy. They kept the noses of their ships, which are easy targets for bomb and shell, against the sands of the beaches until the last soldier and the last piece of equipment was ashore. Ofttimes the guns of destroyers and cruisers blazed the path for our infantry and tanks. Due to the constant vigilance required to fend off attacks by airplanes and submarines, the men manning these ships often do not get more than 2 or 3 hours' sleep a day for as long as a week. In Sicily one of our light cruisers broke up a tank attack by a regiment of the Hermann Goering Division just before it was apparently about to result in disaster to one of our divisions which had not had time to set up its heavy defense equipment. In my judgment the American people are entitled to know more about what the Navy has been doing in order that they may properly appreciate the sacrifices of

the men who go down to the sea in ships.

It is inspiring to observe that in both the Army and the Navy morale seems to be higher where the hazard is greatest. This is particularly true of the men who man our "pigboats," or submarines. I had an opportunity to talk to the officers and men of many of our underwater craft who are carrying the war to the very shores of Japan. I asked a lad who was a member of the crew of a submarine in drydock at Pearl Harbor, where a huge dent caused by a depth charge was being ironed out, whether he would prefer service on a surface ship. His reply was, "Hell, no. It's safer down there than up above when those airplanes come in with their torpedoes and bombs."

CHINA'S DIFFICULTIES

Due to the great importance of China to the Allied cause, I regretted that our visit there was not long enough to enable us to have time to go more fully into the details of the situation there. We did, however, have ample opportunity to confer with Generals Stilwell and Chen-nault and to visit with the generalissimo and the leading figures of his government at Chungking.

Some of the conditions noted in China were most disturbing. Such industries as the country possessed were largely in the area occupied by the Japanese. The country has been in an exhausting war for a number of years, and they have suffered great losses. Chinese troops are poorly equipped, and in their present state of affairs are confined to defensive and guerrilla action. To apply the word "army" to the forces of China is not to use that word in the sense usually understood when referring to the armed forces of other leading Allied Powers. Their form of government lacks many of the elements of a democracy, as the term is generally accepted in our country. The generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, is a great patriot. In him rests China's last best hope of salvation as a free and unified democratic state. If any one man in China can accomplish this, he will do it. He is confronted with great difficulties, the details of which I shall not relate.

Notwithstanding all his handicaps, the generalissimo refuses even to discuss peace overtures with the Japs, and the fact that China is still in the war as our ally requires the attention of 15 or more Japanese divisions.

In my opinion, General Chennault is one of the most brilliant soldiers this war has produced. With an incredibly small number of effective airplanes, he is contributing greatly to keeping China a factor in the war. Certainly no man has ever done more with so little. Considering the limitations upon him, General Stilwell is also rendering a great service to his country and the Allied cause.

It is requiring a superhuman effort to furnish General Chennault's air forces, but the maintenance of air bases in China is of such importance that we should attack the problem of supplying him with redoubled vigor.

On account of her proximity to Japan and her knowledge of the Japanese people, China has the most effective intelligence service on Japanese activities of any of the Allied Powers.

We received information from the most reliable sources in China to the effect that we were still continuing to underestimate the strength of Japan, particularly in the field of production. We were advised that instead of the 500 planes generally estimated here, the Japs were making more than a thousand planes a month, and were producing twice as much shipping as they were before Pearl Harbor. This may be the answer to the amazement of our commanding officers in the South Pacific as to where the Japs get the planes to replace the large numbers that are shot down so rapidly there.

In addition to the ocean shipping, the Japanese are manufacturing large numbers of lightweight shallow-draft wooden ships powered by Diesel engines. They are using them for interisland transportation, and in some cases over considerable distances. Much timber is being taken from occupied China for the purpose of constructing these ships, and we were also told that they had even used some of the trees from the Emperor's sacred forest in Japan for this construction. I asked some of our submarine commanders about this, and they confirmed the reports that we had received in China. These ships constitute quite a problem to our submarines. Oftentimes submarine commanders do not feel justified in expending a long way from home priceless torpedoes in sinking such small craft. They surface, and sink them with gunfire. Practically all of these wooden ships are armed, and we have undoubtedly sustained some losses of submarines in these actions.

One unit of the Chinese Army is fully trained and equipped. Our transport planes which are flying equipment in to General Chennault returned with cargoes of Chinese soldiers. Many thousands of these men who could not be armed and equipped in China have been flown out to a point where equipment could be provided, and are now fully armed, completely furnished with motorized transport, and have been thoroughly trained in all of the latest methods of warfare. Our officers are confident that they are first-class fighting men and will give a good account of themselves when they come to grips with the enemy.

LEAVE AFTER LONG SERVICE OVERSEAS

The first question asked by every enlisted man and junior officer who has been overseas any considerable length of time is, "When are we going to get some leave to go home?" All of the veterans realize the value of the experience they have acquired in actual combat, and practically none of them expect to be released from service until the job is done, but there is an overwhelming feeling on the part of those who have been overseas for many long months that arrangements should be made to give them a respite from their trials and dangers, and a chance to see their families.

Every member of the committee is agreed that the War Department should immediately adopt some policy of returning troops home for a leave or rest after certain services have been performed. This has worked well in the case of the crews of our airplanes, who are allowed a fixed period of rest after a certain number of sorties, which varies in different theaters of operations. I believe it would be a great incentive to the men and would still further reinforce the fine morale that is now displayed if all of them had definite prospect of a visit home after the performance of a certain task or period of service for which they are assigned. For obvious reasons this is a difficult matter on which to legislate, but the committee has made strong recommendations to the War Department and the Navy Department that a fair policy of leaves be promulgated.

The one bright spot in many of the isolated places where our men are serving has been the American Red Cross and the U. S. O. troupes. There is no way to compute what these touches of home life have meant to boys who are working and fighting under almost impossible conditions. The girls in the Red Cross canteens have been worth their weight in gold, and the resourcefulness they have displayed in all conceivable circumstances has been amazing. We met several of the U. S. O. troupes. Some of them were tired and worn, but they were still carrying on, and I am sure that none of them have ever played to more appreciative audiences. A report to the headquarters of our forces in the Middle East on the trials of a group of these entertainers whose stage was the burning sands of the deserts enabled us to have a better appreciation of what these stage people are doing. The report read:

Attitude of troupe so far is very good. Tonight will play Basra and depart for Khorramshahr tomorrow. Accordion now useless as heat melted wax.

Men who live close to death think on the spiritual side of life. We attended church services at several places, and were much impressed by the manner in which the chaplains are carrying out their multifold duties. We likewise visited several cemeteries where rest those heroes who have made the supreme sacrifice. Even in the haste and confusion of war our honored dead have not been neglected. Those who have loved ones or friends who have fallen in battle would be comforted if they could see the well-kept cemeteries where they sleep, and the solicitude of the chaplains in charge to have every grave properly marked amidst surroundings of appropriate dignity.

SEABEES AND ENGINEERS

Any account of our observations without a word of praise to the Navy Seabees and the Army Engineers would be incomplete as well as unjust to some of the heroes of this war. From the frozen lava beds of Iceland to the blistering sands of the deserts, these men work as high as 20 hours some days constructing facilities that are essential to modern war. When the history of this war is

written, their unselfish sacrifices and tireless labor should adorn one of its brightest pages. To date they have received far too little credit.

EXPECTATIONS OF RELIEF

I was very much concerned to note that for some reason many of the most recent of our allies and our late enemies have great expectations as to what they are to receive from the United States in the way of relief and rehabilitation. It is very unfortunate that their expectations are so high. The widespread idea that we are preparing to look after all of the needs of the world and to restore the destruction wrought by this war has caused me seriously to question the wisdom of delegating to a civilian agency the responsibility of handling relief and rehabilitation abroad. The establishment of a large civilian agency with widespread activities is likely either to generate unnecessary bitterness by failing to fulfill hopes that are excessive or else prove to be a more expensive undertaking than the American people should be compelled to finance. I believe it would be much better for all concerned if the people of north Africa and Italy, particularly, were frankly given to understand now that, while willing to assist to a reasonable extent, we do not consider it the responsibility of the United States to rebuild destroyed cities or embark upon any long-time program of relief.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, does the Senator desire to yield at all?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to yielding. I was endeavoring to present the statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. At that point would not the Senator also confirm that some of the most responsible men we saw, from some of the other countries, felt that was very wise?

Mr. RUSSELL. One man who occupies a very responsible position with a nation, a man who should be familiar with the circumstances in that area, confirmed my ideas about that, and told the entire group that he thought it would be much better to put it on a temporary basis.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that within 3 or 4 months they would be able to get on a self-sustaining basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. And not become mendicants of this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Let them know that in the last analysis they will be compelled to work out their own destiny and restore the destruction of war by their own efforts.

Such necessary relief can be handled by the Army, even if a unit has to be established for that purpose. The Army can supply rations in the areas that have suffered most severely, and thereby prevent actual starvation. In no case should relief or rehabilitation assume such proportions that the recipients will have reason to expect or depend on American bounty for any long period of time. I hope that I do not sound callous when I say that in my opinion this relief should be on a tem-

porary basis, and so far as adults are concerned should be confined to the very minimum, a sufficiency for a short period to maintain life, but kept so small that it will not stifle a desire to supplement the ration received from us through other efforts. We should be very careful not to publicize or embark upon a policy which will either lead to greater misunderstanding or result in stupendous charges against the Treasury that our people should not be called upon to meet.

OUR BRITISH ALLIES

Wherever we went we were most courteously received by the officials of the British Empire. I was much impressed by their frankness in discussing not only the conduct of the war but post-war problems. The people of England have made great sacrifices in this war and have displayed a fortitude, in the face of constant danger, which we might well emulate. Many of their cities have been heavily bombed. The food in England was poorer than in any other place we visited. All clothing is strictly rationed. Civilians have practically no gasoline and are converting their cars and trucks to charcoal burners.

The British people have hospitably received the American soldiers who are stationed in their midst. From a military standpoint, they have displayed every quality that one could ask in an ally. The British Tommy is a first-class soldier. Wherever I had an opportunity to visit with our Navy both enlisted men and officers spoke in glowing terms of the skill and seamanship and the courage of the British tar. The Royal Navy is still living up to its finest traditions. The heroic exploits of the Royal Air Force already belong to the legends of this war. As fighting men they are good partners to have in a scrap.

We had some opportunity to observe the operation of the British Government not only at home but throughout the Empire. I came home with a healthy respect bordering on envy for the efficiency of the British in administration, and in the handling of their relations with other nations, and in their own vast dominion. The British have a definite foreign policy with respect to every corner of the globe. Every civil servant and every officer of any rank is apparently fully acquainted with Empire policy as it applies either militarily, diplomatically, or commercially. Every action of the responsible officials of government is designed to promote that policy.

If our Nation has a definite policy which extends longer than 6 months after the conclusion of the war in any of the far-flung lands in which American troops are fighting and American dollars are being spent, I was unable to find anyone among our officers abroad who could define it.

We cannot afford to rely upon even so splendid an ally as the United Kingdom to protect all our interests, or there will be inevitable conflict and confusion after the war. Our civil agencies abroad are numerous, but too often they are either

working at cross purposes or, worse to relate, in some cases have no apparent purpose. Our post-war interests are being neglected, and we stand to get very little or no return from our immense expenditures.

In places our representation abroad was apparently weak. Too many of our representatives still appear to rely upon ancient protocol and the easy ways and flowery terms which have been in vogue in the past. This is a day of realism, as might be expected when great peoples are fighting for their very lives. Realists are directing this war in the field as well as in places of power, not only in enemy lands but among our allies. We would do well to assume a more realistic attitude. In my opinion all of our civilian agencies operating outside the United States should be coordinated in the hands of some two-fisted American who has an understanding of American interests in all international matters. The old type of kid-glove diplomacy, including high-flown but vague phraseology, does not have any place in today's international dealings. Everyone can understand men like Admiral Standley, who bluntly speak their minds; and whatever may have been his other qualifications I believe that representatives of his type will create more respect and genuine good will for the United States throughout the world than many of the men and most of the methods we are now employing.

We should keep closer check on the expensive tools of war that we are dealing out on such a gigantic scale under lend-lease arrangements. In the Mediterranean area and the Middle East our British allies have stressed the fact that they have given large quantities of war supplies to Turkey as very effective propaganda to gain the good will of the 250,000,000 Mohammedans of the world. Much of this military equipment transferred by England to Turkey is American-made and American-financed equipment, and was transferred to England under lend-lease. Every sensible person realizes that we will not be paid in full for all of the material of war which we have advanced to our allies under lend-lease. No one really expects it. In my judgment, it is a very poor policy to permit lend-lease equipment, paid for by the people of the United States, to be used to buy good will even for our closest friend when good will is such an important commodity. If it is good business for England to get credit with Turkey and the friends of Turkey for helping that nation in time of danger, it would seem to me to be worth something to the United States.

In like manner some of the equipment which is included in the British transfers to Russia is American-made or American-bought. American food handled on a lend-lease basis has likewise been used by the British Food Commission to feed refugees and other hungry peoples of the earth, and I doubt that the recipient is always aware of the fact that the United States was the true benefactor.

I would be the last to do or say anything which would cause any breach between our country and our British allies. I believe that the future peace of the world largely depends upon a complete understanding between us. However, matters of this kind can surely be adjusted without disturbing good relations. No people are perfect, including our own; and I feel that there will be a better understanding and more mutual respect between us and less possibility of feeling which might prevent or postpone a complete accord after the war if such matters are worked out as we go along.

One source of irritation to our men who are serving in that large portion of the world which is under the aegis of that great news agency, Reuter's, is the paucity of news as to the American war effort. After having traveled for practically a month in that area I can understand how they feel. On some days it would have been difficult from reading the papers to know that the United States was participating in the war at all. National pride, of course, colors our own news, and we are not slow to boast about the accomplishments of our armed forces.

However, it seems to me that, on the whole, our press has been much fairer with our allies in reporting the war than they have been with us. I could give many illustrations, but this excerpt from a leading paper in Australia illustrates what I am talking about. The article was written on the day that Italy surrendered. Despite the kindness with which our troops have been received in Australia, it is disturbing to an American soldier there to read:

There is great joy in Britain that Italy's downfall should so largely be a British Empire affair. Empire forces were responsible for 90 percent of the battles from the first battle in East Africa right to the final landing on the Italian mainland.

THE INDIA-BURMA THEATER

All in all, the morale of our troops in India appeared to be lower than in any other theater. India is in many respects a very depressing place for troops to be stationed. This great country of 350,000,000 souls is a land of contrasts, of great wealth of the few and indescribable poverty and filth of the many. A great famine is sweeping some of the provinces, causing unspeakable suffering and many deaths from starvation. Any investigation of the complex problem posed by the conflicts between castes and creeds, Indian Nationalists and British Government, ancient ingrained habit and today's civilization, was not within the scope of our duties. The days that I spent in India, however, did confirm me in the belief that it would require unremitting investigation over many years to even faintly understand the so-called Indian problem, and that those who have never been there, but have a 5-minute solution, are extremely foolhardy. There was much comment on the part of our troops on the very apparent lethargy of the British war effort in that area. This lethargy has undoubtedly

affected morale. I have no knowledge of what should be implied from the appointment of Lord Mountbatten to command the large forces assembled in this theater, but I have reason to hope that it means that the period of inactivity is about to be ended. I met Lord Mountbatten in London. Any opinion formed on such a brief meeting may easily be erroneous, but I am strongly impressed that Mountbatten is not the type of man who will permit the Japs to continue to occupy Burma and to strengthen their hold on Malaya and the Indies, without annoyance. He struck me as being a man of action, who will not be content with a moribund strategy of defense.

PETROLEUM

This war of mechanized transport, involving millions of vehicles from huge ocean liners to the innumerable jeeps which have become so indispensable, is consuming petroleum products in staggering amounts. Up to now we have been depleting our petroleum stocks at a ruinous rate, supplying not only our own forces but those of our allies. It is high time to utilize the petroleum deposits of other parts of the world. Otherwise, the end of the war will find our own deposits practically exhausted.

The President's statement this week that plans are being made to accomplish this is highly gratifying. There may have been sound reasons heretofore for not more widely employing the huge deposits of the Persian Gulf. These reasons were based upon difficulties of transportation. With the opening of the Mediterranean and the great increase in construction of shipping, there is no longer any valid reason for not giving our oil deposits a rest, and tapping those of other areas.

At one time we were shipping high octane gasoline to Russia, which has great petroleum reserves, but lacked refineries. Refineries have now been supplied Russia. We should no longer be compelled to draw on our dwindling petroleum reserves for use in most of the foreign theaters of operation.

POST-WAR AIR RIGHTS

All of us are concerned about American rights in air bases and air facilities which have been constructed at our expense all over the world. There should be no delay in having some definite understanding and agreement as to the post-war rights of our commercial aviation. Certainly we occupy a better position to negotiate such understandings now than we will after the war is over. We cannot expect to have sovereignty over all bases that we have constructed for military purposes, but we should be able to assure to American enterprise an equal chance with others in these bases we have paid for, and the right to operate in all parts of the world.

Air power is the decisive factor in this war. With the great developments being made daily in aviation, the peace of the world and the outcome of any future wars will depend directly upon air power. Planes must have bases from which to operate. We should begin now to plan for the post-war period, both to assure

the future defense of the United States and to assist in maintaining world peace on a basis of justice and equality.

Many of our close offshore bases are built on lands under foreign flags. I have never been satisfied with the 99-year lease given the United States in the destroyer deal negotiated by this country before we entered the war. This is not any 99-year country! Where would we be today if Jefferson had handled the Louisiana Purchase on any such basis, or if our rights in Florida, or if even the Alaska Purchase, had been subjected to any such limitation? If we can be trusted for 99 years to occupy and develop defenses on the lands belonging to our allies, but essential to our defense, there is no reason why future generations, who will still be paying for this war, should be denied the protection these bases afford.

Time can bring remarkable changes. War will move much faster in the future than it has even in this day of blitz. With the tide of lend-lease running high from our shores, future generations of Americans should not be subjected to the danger of having these bases, built and maintained by Americans, used against them 100 years from now. It should be possible to work out some arrangements which will give us permanently such protection as these bases may afford.

There are many other important spots on the globe which have been fortified and developed with American money and sweat, which will become increasingly important to the defense of the United States with the rapid improvement of air and sea transportation. The smaller the world becomes, the closer are these bases to our shores.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the importance of some arrangement with the Government of Iceland in the post-war period which will permit us to use the very expensive facilities we have constructed on that island. A glance at the map will show that heavy bombers and submarines based on Iceland can close all of the shipping lanes of the north Atlantic. In any future war, control of Iceland means control of the north Atlantic Ocean.

We are now in Iceland at the invitation of the Icelandic Government issued before Pearl Harbor. Our British allies, appreciating the significance and importance of Iceland, had moved in some time before. It was a very fortunate thing that they did, because if Germany had beaten the British to Iceland it could have prolonged this war by years, and undoubtedly would have enormously increased the losses of the Allied Nations. Iceland, with 120,000 people, occupying an area of 40,000 square miles, manifestly cannot defend itself against aggression. A strong enemy in Iceland would ever be a great menace to the security of the United States. We should endeavor to protect the millions of dollars and the tremendous effort that we have spent to secure our northern flank and sea lanes in this war by building fields and bases in Iceland. If in the future we should have another war it would cost the lives of

many American boys and the expenditure of even greater sums to restore our present position.

Dakar, on the West Coast of Africa, occupies the same position in relation to the South Atlantic that Iceland does to the North Atlantic. As a matter of self-defense we should see to it either that we have some rights in Dakar or that it does not fall into unfriendly hands, or is not committed to the custody of those who are unable to defend this vital base which can dominate the South Atlantic and threaten all South America.

In the Pacific our boys are already fighting and dying over and around the islands that were mandated to Japan after the last World War. Much more precious blood will be shed before the Japs are finally rooted out. Certainly as a result of the sacrifices of these men, and to prevent the further killing of the boys of the second or third generation moving back into these islands in some future war, we should have some definite policy with respect to the future status of these islands that will assure the defense of the United States, as well as contribute to the peace of the world. We have rights in these islands that are being purchased today with the blood of American boys.

I spent several days on the island of New Caledonia, one of the westernmost of the Pacific islands. This is a French possession. In order to assure an open sea route to Australia and the bases of operations against the Japs in the islands of the Pacific, we have spent many million dollars fortifying this island. It has a fine, natural, land-locked harbor. We have built wharves and docks, seaplane bases, airfields, and roads, barracks, and hospitals, and placed heavy defense artillery to beat off the strongest Japanese attack. We have in operation at our bases there some of the finest repair and machine shops that I saw anywhere in the world. In brief, New Caledonia has been transformed by American dollars and American sweat and sacrifice into an all but impregnable fortress. So long as it is in friendly hands and we have any considerable naval and air power, no enemy from the west can with safety attack either North or South America without first reducing it.

In the past we have heard a great deal about the fortification of Guam. I do not know what future plans or program for the fortification of Guam the American Congress will be compelled to pass upon; but I believe that if we could obtain rights in New Caledonia and utilize the fortifications and facilities already existing, it would save much of the expense of fortifying Guam. It seems to me that negotiations should be entered into at the earliest possible date looking to the acquisition, by fair and just arrangements, either of title to all of New Caledonia or perpetual rights in and to the bases and facilities we have constructed. I know that there are those who will hurl the charge of imperialism at such suggestions and claim that they are in derogation to the terms of the Atlantic Charter. I do not think that there is anything imperialistic about it.

Call it what you will, it is a realistic step to prevent another generation of Americans, who will undoubtedly still be paying for the present war, from being compelled to pay again in blood and treasure in taking these islands back from the same enemy who may obtain them if we follow the policy of take and abandon after this war is over.

American boys will soon be dying to free the soil of France from a foreign invader. We are now equipping many French divisions in north Africa with American arms in order that they may join in the fight for the liberation of France. We are supplying the French people in north Africa with petroleum, clothing, and many other articles through lend-lease. When the motherland of France is freed from the German invader we will undoubtedly spend huge sums for relief and rehabilitation in France. It is not too much to ask that for the sake of the future defense of America we be given some rights in an island which means nothing to the defense of France but may be vital to our own defense.

OVERCONFIDENCE A GREAT DANGER

Nothing that I saw in the course of my travels would justify any confidence that the war is nearly over. Indeed, I believe that overoptimism is one of the enemies which the American people must constantly fight, day and night. The German Army, though extended to the limit, is still a most formidable military organization. Their first-line troops are still the equal of any in skill and fanatical bravery.

While in north Africa we were told of an incident in Sicily involving a company of German parachute troops who were posted in an olive grove with orders to delay at any cost the American advance for 12 hours. When the grove was finally stormed and captured, over 200 of the 250 men stationed there were dead, and the remainder, with 4 or 5 exceptions, were wounded. One of the unwounded leaped at his American captor and bit him entirely through the hand. The Germans are giving ground in Russia and in Italy, but discipline is still strong, and their retreats are still orderly. They are falling back to ever stronger defenses, and it is always well to bear in mind that up to the time of the armistice in 1918 the German Army was carrying out orders and was still a strong and organized fighting force.

Any hope for an early defeat of Germany must depend upon the collapse of the Army due to shortage of fighting equipment, or to a break-down of civilian morale and revolution within. They are taking a terrific pounding by day and by night from our gallant airmen and the R. A. F. We will soon be in a position to increase substantially the bombing of Germany from bases in Italy as well as from England, and the number of German factories destroyed and families driven from their homes will greatly increase.

But all of this is not done without losses to us. The Germans have turned from the production of bombers to fighter

planes in the effort to stop the destruction of their homeland from the air. They are devising new methods such as the rocket guns and small parachute bombs dropped from the air in the effort to destroy our air forces. While our military authorities say the price we are paying is not excessive in comparison with the destruction our air forces are causing, we must frankly face the fact that the increasing tempo of bombing likewise brings about increasingly severe losses of our own in men and equipment.

In the Pacific we have only whipped the Japanese in the outposts of their ill-gotten empire. The bulk of their Army and the major units of their Navy have not yet been brought into action. We have a long, hard, bloody job before us, and I fear that the sacrifices, shocks, and losses we must yet endure are much greater than the average American citizen anticipates.

In summation of my observations, I would say:

First. American production has justified our proudest boasts by turning out tools of war of high quality in huge quantities. The men in the field are satisfied with the weapons issued them. We are making great strides in assembling the facilities of transportation necessary to fight a war on every continent and every sea of the globe. This stupendous effort constitutes a great drain upon our natural resources. We should pay more attention to the utilization of raw materials of other lands, lest the end of the war find those resources virtually untapped and our own exhausted. We should be more careful in the distribution of the products of American industry financed by American taxpayers.

Second. Our lack of a post-war policy and stronger representation abroad in some key positions is likely to cost us dearly in the post-war period. All agencies having to do with any phase of the war effort abroad should be coordinated.

Third. We must constantly combat any tendency to underestimate our enemies or to delude ourselves with optimism. The slightest relaxation in the national war effort at home will be paid in the blood of American boys fighting overseas.

Fourth. The American Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are well fed, well equipped, and every reasonable provision has been made for their health, comfort, and welfare. No armed force in history has ever been so well supplied. Command and staff work have been of the highest caliber. Our leaders have to date accomplished all that the American people could have reasonably expected of them.

Fifth. The general conduct of our troops in action has been good. Their discipline is satisfactory and they are daily becoming more efficient in the grim business of war. Combat experience is forging our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps into the toughest and most efficient fighting machine the world has ever seen. No one who has ever had any contact with troops would contend that every man is a fearless hero, who craves contact with the enemy, but as organiza-

tions our men have displayed courage and a willingness to fight and sacrifice which measures up to or surpasses the finest traditions of our armed services. The number of individuals who have performed remarkable feats of heroism, requiring resourcefulness and great personal bravery, is unusually high. The men in uniform have made up their minds to see this thing through to victory, whatever it may take. If our civilian population gives them unstinted support, they will win the total victory over our enemies perhaps sooner than we have any right to expect.

Mr. President, what I have said is the record, as complete as I can make it, of my remarks in the executive session of the Senate on October 7. It has not been altered materially in either form or substance. I tried to be factual, and to speak as objectively as possible.

We are told that what was said here has caused a great deal of bitterness and resentment in the United Kingdom. If this be true as to my own case, my high opinion of the British people would cause me to believe that the accounts they received must have been distorted even worse than by our own press. Not a word of my statement was intended as an attack on Great Britain. If any official of the British Empire, or if the British press or people, be offended, it is regrettable, for no offense is intended. But I would not have this statement construed anywhere as an apology for my position. If offense be found, I must say in all candor that our British allies have become unduly sensitive if an American citizen and Senator cannot discuss the operations and policies of his own government, of which I am a part, without raising a storm of furor and resentment throughout the United Kingdom and the Empire.

My admiration for the British people is almost extravagant, but it must be remembered that I think and speak as a citizen and a Senator of the United States. What I saw was through American eyes. I observed, weighed, and reported as an American who properly holds the future welfare of these United States above any other consideration. I would regret if any word of mine should cause dissension or ill feeling between the United States and any of our allies, but if that word be necessary to protect a legitimate vital interest, either during this war or in the post-war world, I would still feel duty-bound to speak.

The chain which binds the United Nations together is frail indeed if there are links which cannot stand the strain of expression of opinion made in good faith in the parliamentary bodies of a democracy. There are a few who have expressed the opinion that it is sheer impertinence for a Member of the American Congress to discuss our relations with the British or the part being played by them in the war. Such people would do well to observe the fine restraint and poise shown by the American people when officials of the British Empire tell us what is expected of us, and adopt it as a model of future behavior. Only a

few days ago that pillar of empire and great world figure, General Smuts, in a speech which was widely publicized throughout the world as an expression of official British opinion, told the people of the United States very frankly that we were expected to furnish in large measure the men who will make the bloody assault to breach Hitler's fortress of Europe. Few Americans failed to grasp all the implications of General Smuts' statement. The lives of American boys are infinitely more precious to us than all the material which will ever be handled under lend-lease. Nevertheless, General Smuts' statement did not evoke any great public resentment and outcry in the United States. The President did not send a message to Congress commenting with thinly veiled sarcasm on advice from abroad. I have not seen in the American press caricatures of General Smuts, ridiculing him for making a public statement as to what he considered the obligation of America in the performance of its duty to the common effort. I have not heard of any Member of Congress becoming unduly excited.

Every patriotic American expects our country to do its full part in this war, but I do not believe that doing our part requires us so to keep our light under a bushel that, where permitted to think, we are expected to speak in whispers of the contribution of our own country to the cause of Allied victory.

I therefore am not greatly disturbed by that portion of the American press or officialdom which sees ghosts every time any person in American public life has the temerity to suggest that it is proper for our allies to appreciate the extent of our efforts and sacrifices in this war as we appreciate their efforts and sacrifices. We have come to a pretty pass if a citizen of the United States cannot support with wholehearted devotion the cause of his own country without subjecting himself to the charge that he is anti-British or anti-Russian.

Recently a man who has spent his life in the service of the United States was pilloried in some quarters because he publicly stated that the people of Russia were not fully aware of the assistance given them by this country. Russian Armies and Russian people have won the undying gratitude of the American people for the heroism and spirit of sacrifice with which they have met the onslaught of the brutal hordes of Nazi Germany. Too much praise cannot be given their heroism, and with rare exceptions that praise has been spread with lavish hand in every public forum in the United States and through press and pulpit. It does not detract one jot or tittle from the valor of the Russian Armies or the sacrifices of the Russian people to mention in public the fact that the United States, and, for that matter, Great Britain, as well, have made a stupendous effort to furnish equipment to those armies, and that the equipment given must have contributed in some measure to the victories won.

The American people have before them each day the achievements of the Russian Armies. The Russian Government has not hesitated to complain fre-

quently and publicly of our failure to open a second front when and where Russia wants it instead of when and where our own military experts think advisable. The American people have expressed no resentment of this criticism, and it is inexplicable to me that a suggestion that the masses of the Russian people should have knowledge of our efforts to aid them is likely to cause disunity between comrades in a fight involving the fate and freedom of both the people of the United States and of Russia.

I yield to no one in the fervor of my desire for the closest unity between the Allied Nations to achieve the victory over our common enemies. I am as anxious as any man for the United States to cooperate with Russia, England, China, and the other Allied Powers in maintaining peace in the years to follow that victory. I believe any lasting world peace must have as its keystone a complete understanding between the United States and the British Empire. But, Mr. President, this cooperation and understanding cannot be had except upon a basis of equality and frank and fair dealings. If such matters as I have touched upon in this report cannot be publicly discussed by a Senator of the United States even in time of war, it certainly does not augur well for the harmonious relations the American people so earnestly desire in the post-war period, because victory over our enemies will far from settle all world problems.

For my own part, I have too great a faith in the common sense and inherent fairness of the average citizen of all the United Nations, wherever he may live, to believe that harm can result from fully publicizing the true facts as to the contribution of every nation engaged in this great common enterprise, whether it be military operations on land and sea or in the operations of lend-lease, either direct or reverse. Frank discussion will always dissipate the clouds of suspicion. It will promote a better understanding between all the Allied Nations in the trying days ahead of us after the victory is won. It will pave the way for the necessary sense of appreciation of sacrifices in a common cause which begets good will between peoples. On such good will and understanding any permanent peace for this stricken world must depend.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] to insert after line 9 a new section.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I intend to support the committee measure, Senate Resolution 192, largely because I believe the third paragraph of the resolution goes as far as the Senate should go at this time toward commitments by the United States as to what foreign policies it shall pursue in a post-war world of which we do not, and cannot, see the pattern at this time.

I cannot support the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on behalf of himself and other Senators, which has been so ably espoused by himself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. My reason for opposing the substitute I shall state later in these brief remarks.

Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind, nor, I believe, in yours, that 90 percent of all the peoples in all the nations of the world want peace, an enduring and, if possible, a perpetual peace, when this cruel war is over. We and they are willing to make considerable sacrifices in the hope of attaining that goal. From a reading of history, I think that has been true in every major world conflict. Always there has been held out to the people by their leaders that once the war is won, the leaders will so arrange the world that there will be no more wars. The "war to end war" has been a very potent slogan. I, myself, would like to believe that is the kind of war we are fighting today.

This high ambition, this most laudable ideal, inspired Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations in 1919, though its high purpose was somewhat warped by those who wrote the Treaty of Versailles.

There are those who believe that if the United States Senate had approved the League covenant following World War No. 1, and guaranteed the boundary lines therein established, there would not have been a World War No. 2. I shall not go into that argument. Those who make it follow a very simple line of reasoning. The Senate did not ratify the League covenant. We are in the midst of World War No. 2. Whether these two incontrovertible facts prove that if the Senate had approved the League covenant we would not have had World War No. 2 I leave for others to argue, and to reach their own decisions.

At any rate, it is up to the United States—and I would stress that it also is up to the British Government, and to Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union, and General Chiang Kai-shek of China—to work out some basis for a program for the post-war world which will at least minimize the chances for another world war in the near future.

The pending resolution realizes, accepts, and would implement by action, that we, and other nations of the world, particularly the leading nations of the world, must cooperate and organize for peace, for a just peace, and the maintenance of that peace to the maximum degree possible.

The pending resolution also realizes, and accepts and proclaims to the world as well as to our own people, that such post-war cooperation should and will have to be brought about without impairing the essential independence and sovereignty of our own United States of America. It is neither desirable nor necessary, thank God, that the United States become a dominion in a super-state or a satellite nation to some other nation or group of nations, in order to obtain cooperation, collaboration, or participation in the interest of world peace.

The resolution also recognizes, and accepts as fundamental to our participation in any post-war program, that the final determination of such participation must be made in accordance with our constitutional processes. I agree with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] most emphatically that—

We owe it to candor to make this necessity and this intention plain to our own people, and to the world, which especially needs to understand.

Mr. President, the pending resolution also realizes—and in that it is realistic—that the Senate cannot and ought not to attempt to forestall the unknown future by committing itself and the people of the United States to a blue-print of our future participation in some form of world organization, when it is beyond the limits of human knowledge to know what kind of a planners' blue-print will meet the situations that will exist and follow each other in the world after this war is won.

The resolution states, in general terms, but not in vague language which would conceal or pervert, the principles it sets forth, that the United States will, in good faith and to the limits of reason, participate with other free and sovereign nations and will do its full part in establishing and maintaining a just peace after the war is over.

The resolution also makes plain that no one is authorized to commit the United States to the exact form of post-war cooperation and participation; that any program negotiated will be subject to United States acceptance by constitutional processes, that is, Senate ratification, before such a program will be binding upon the United States and the people of the United States.

The resolution gives notice to the world that we will go the limit for world peace; it also gives notice that the Government of the United States, and the people of the United States, through our constitutional processes, reserve the right to pass on the program itself before finally accepting it.

Mr. President, I must admit that certain arguments made in support of amendments to the resolution are not conclusive to me.

For instance, it has been stated on the floor, as an argument why the Senate should not inform the world frankly and aboveboard that the Congress of the United States, under the Constitution, has the responsibility of passing on official agreements with other nations before the agreements become binding, and that it intends to exercise that responsibility, first, that through his position as head of the Cabinet of the Parliament of Great Britain, Prime Minister Churchill can speak finally for Britain in the peace conference; second, that General Chiang Kai-shek can speak with authority for China; third, that certainly Premier Stalin can speak with authority for what Russia will do. And as a corollary, I quote from one of the arguments made on the Senate floor:

But can the President of the United States speak with any real authority as to what

obligations the United States will undertake, as to the kind of institution or organization or authority in which it will participate, or how much power may be delegated to such authority today? He cannot do so today. He can speak with that authority only if he has clear, strong advice from the Senate.

Mr. President, to my mind objections voiced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the pending resolution indicate that he, and other supporters of the Pepper amendment, want the President empowered by the Senate to speak with final authority at the peace conferences as to what obligations the United States will undertake, as to the kind of institution or organization or authority in which the United States will participate, and how much power will be delegated to such authority.

I will be perfectly frank. I do not want such broad, such blank-check powers delegated by the Senate to the President of the United States. This is no reflection upon the man who now holds that high office. I would not be willing to vote for extending such powers to any President.

I earnestly believe that the wise thing for the Senate to do, the patriotic thing for the Senate to do—and I still believe in patriotic support of my own country, despite the slurs cast upon nationalism and national patriotism—and the right thing for the Senate to do, is to approve the resolution recommended by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, without amendment and by an overwhelming majority. I hope that will be done. It represents a sound program and I believe the country will approve it.

Mr. President, last night I had the pleasure of listening to an inspirational—but realistic, rather than romantic—address by Mr. Eric A. Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the annual Navy Day dinner of the Navy League, at the Mayflower Hotel, in this city.

Because I believe that every Senator would do well to read and study Mr. Johnston's address—it would be a good thing if every American citizen could read it—I am going to ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

While I have the floor, I desire also to direct special attention to one or two of the statements made by Mr. Johnston. He said:

After this war we will still be living in a most imperfect world, as far as ever from the millenium, and under these circumstances our chief reliance must be upon our own strength—upon our common horse sense, and upon our cooperation with the United Nations.

We fought in World War No. 1 to save democracy. But when we saw democracy evaporating in Europe in the thirties we felt a good deal like the mountain that labored and brought forth a mouse. We thought we were going to give the world a new conception of Thomas Jefferson, but we got an Austrian paperhanger and an Italian jackal instead.

This time we must preserve the peace. And the men out there realize it, too. I am talking about the men that are exchanging slugs all over the world. They are asking questions, and the questions make sense.

If I know anything about these young men from my personal contacts with them overseas, it is that they will insist upon the preservation of opportunity in America. The spirit of enterprise is very much alive in our country today.

Our young men in uniform when they come back from all over the world will want an America that is open—open to them to get jobs—open to the opportunity for a plumber's son to become a doctor, or a doctor's son to become a plumber, if that is what he wishes.

After this war we may find ourselves an island of free enterprise, just as after the Revolutionary War we found ourselves an island of democracy. After this war, if we are an island of free enterprise and make it work here, then again by precept and example much of the rest of the world may follow us. For a strong and prosperous America can be of unlimited value in assisting other countries of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. Eric Johnston be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a Marine, I presume that the Corps expects me this evening to go all the way from the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli. But even with all the means of modern communication you couldn't cover that distance in one night, nor tell about the exploits of the Marine Corps in a thousand and one nights of constant recitation. And so I have chosen the easy and less arduous course by talking about the smaller and less conspicuous portion of our service—the Navy.

America should never cease to be proud of our Navy. Some of our oldest traditions, our most magnificent records, our most memorable acts of heroism, are the Navy's contribution to American life. When John Paul Jones said, "I have not yet begun to fight," he spoke for struggling colonies that had not yet begun to fight, not only for their independence, but for political democracy, and economic opportunity, and rugged individualism. When Lawrence said, "Don't give up the ship," it was symbolic of a new nation which was struggling into manhood against innumerable adversities—a new America that was not going to give up the ship. That Nation's greatness and strength still lay ahead.

The spirit of the Navy has been the spirit of America. Realizing the Navy was the first line of American defense, understanding the apathy of many of our countrymen at a time when national danger seemed far removed, the Navy League was formed in 1902 and incorporated January 2, 1903. In 1922 the Navy League instituted Navy Day, on the birthday of President Theodore Roosevelt, October the 27th. A nonpartisan organization of patriotic citizens, its only objective is to strengthen, improve, and perfect the national defense of the United States.

But this Navy Day meeting in the midst of another great World War has a far more significant, a far deeper, meaning. Once more America is pouring its blood and its treasure in unstinted fashion to preserve America's chosen way of life. Once more a new generation is being tested in the fires of battle. All over the world, on the land and in the air as well as on the sea, once again young Americans are making of their bodies and their incorrigible spirit a wall to dam the flood of barbarism that threatened to overrun the planet. Everything that we do or say this evening must be measured by that supreme fact. But our pride in the courage and patriotism of our American manhood is

not unmingled with a gnawing sense of guilt. Deep in our heart of hearts we know that this new generation is finishing a job which some way, some how, we failed to carry to its ultimate conclusion. We recognize that these boys are shedding their blood at least in part to make good our mistakes, to compensate for our shortcomings, to atone for our national apathy.

The fact is that having won a glorious victory in 1918 we failed dismally in the years that followed to preserve that victory. The grass had hardly sprouted on the graves of our illustrious dead until we allowed aggressors to disrupt the unity with which we had faced the crisis of war. Worse than that, in a sort of weariness of spirit we sought escape from national responsibilities in a world of delusions. Having just won a war across the Atlantic, we preferred to believe that the Atlantic and the Pacific were impregnable ramparts, and that therefore events in other parts of the world were no concern of ours.

Although we were the cradle of modern aviation, we allowed others, particularly the European dictators, to develop true air power. Although we were the most highly industrialized nation on the face of the planet, we allowed others to translate technological progress into modern mechanized military might. If we had exercised a fraction of the power which our size, our economic potentialities, our stake in world affairs demanded, we would have been a check on the ambitions of would-be aggressors. Undoubtedly our lack of naval and air preparation was a contributing factor to the Japanese aggressions in Manchuria, the German depredations in Europe, and finally to the global explosion that has now engulfed us all.

If there is one objective in American life that we should underscore it is that never again shall America be caught with her defenses down, that we shall never again allow the illusions of distance, or indifference to the rest of the world, to strip us of an army, an air force, and a navy adequate for our protection in a contracting and shrinking world. It seems to me that theorists should have a great weight upon their conscience. Forgetting the enormous waste caused by unpreparedness in World War No. 1, they preferred to bask in the sunlight of noble theories and completely shut their eyes to ignoble facts. While dictatorships of every color piled up armaments, we allowed our defenses to crumble. It used to be popular to blame wars upon the munitions manufacturers, the financiers, and the producers of raw materials. World War No. 2 can more nearly be laid to the door of the delusions of the pacifists and the panaceas of the prophets. Their influence helped disarm the democracies and paved the highways for the aggressions of the predatory totalitarians. It was this that gave the Axis a head start.

Oh, it is true that we have closed the gap—it is true we have proven that a free society can out-produce a slave economy. In spite of our late start, we are going to win this war—make no mistake about that. But those who want to drench the globe in blood should understand that the democracies have learned their lesson—that never again will they contribute to the ambitions of the aggressors by their lack of preparedness. In the two decades between the two world wars we became disarmed not only in the physical but in the moral and spiritual sense as well. We refused to assume the responsibilities that go with national greatness. We chose the easier, more comfortable, way out by believing that crimes and horrors committed in countries as far away as China and Czechoslovakia were no affairs of ours.

We have fought two world wars to prove the contrary, and we should make it per-

fectly clear to ourselves, and therefore to the rest of the world, that America has an enormous stake in law and order, in peace and prosperity all over the globe. The mere fact that America is no longer smugly indifferent, the mere fact that we are willing to assume our share of the responsibility for world order, will be a stabilizing and pacifying force. This seems to me to be the irreducible minimum of the responsibility which our Nation must accept.

That does not mean, however, the unbridled and reckless commitments which some of our prophets are now demanding. I assume that it is characteristic of American impulsiveness that we tend to swing all the way from entangling alliances to the pyramiding of entanglements and alliances, that we swing all the way from total indifference as to the problems of the rest of the world to wanting to part the hair and brush the teeth of the so-called backward peoples. I speak a word tonight for moderation, for common sense, for American self-interest. I believe that I speak the opinion of the vast majority of Americans when I say that I think we can be good neighbors in the world of tomorrow without moving into our neighbor's house.

My travels around the world have brought me convincing evidence of the great complexity of international relations, of the multitudinous unsolved international problems, of the divergence in points of view and interests between nations. This world isn't a jigsaw puzzle that you can take apart and put together again at will. If we are to steer a safe and sane course through the seas of tomorrow's confusion, we can only do so in a sturdy ship of state, with a strong hand on the steering wheel, and, above all, we must not mistake shallow for deep waters or shimmering mirages for safe harbors. After this war, we will still be living in a most imperfect world, as far as ever from the millennium, and under these circumstances our chief reliance should be upon our own strength—upon our own common horse sense and upon our cooperation with the United Nations.

We fought in World War No. 1 to save democracy. But when we saw democracy evaporating in Europe in the thirties we felt a good deal like the mountain that labored and brought forth a mouse. We thought we were going to give the world a new conception of Thomas Jefferson, but we got an Austrian paperhanger and an Italian jackal instead. It is little wonder that we see victory approaching with the apprehensions and dread that were born of the twenties.

This time we must preserve the peace. And the men out there realize this too. I am talking about the men that are exchanging slugs with the enemy all over the world. They are asking questions, and their questions make sense. They want to know what's the pay off in this show. They are pretty keen about the kind of a world they are going to live in—about the kind of a country they are coming back to. And most of all they want to come back to an America they will recognize—the same honeysuckle growing over the same back fence—the same chance to take a chance in a business of their own. However, there is one thing that's sure, and that is the inevitability of change. And there will be change in the United States after this war—make no mistake about that. But if the United States is going to be modernized and streamlined with all improvements, let's be sure that the streamlining is done according to the wishes of and the just desires of the men who are out doing the fighting. They will want jobs—security against old age and sickness—of course. But they will be just as anxious for the retention of the freedom to work or not to work for whom they please—to be their own masters.

If I know anything about those young men from my personal contacts with them overseas, it is that they will insist upon the preservation of opportunity in America. The spirit of enterprise is very much alive in our country today. That spirit lives here as nowhere else in the world. Give it a chance. Our young men in uniform when they come back from all over the world will want an America that is open—open to them to get jobs—open to them to be employers of labor or leaders of labor—open to the opportunity for a plumber's son to become a doctor or a doctor's son to become a plumber if that is what he wishes. Those men out there—they have their eyes on the bombsights and the gunsights, but they have their head on the future, too. You don't rub shoulders day after day with death without measuring with accurate precision the things you want to live for. I saw this evidenced time after time and again in the great air bases in England from which the bombers and fighters take off to spread devastation and destruction to the Nazi heart land, and incidentally to bring modern war to the very front door of the German people for the first time. Sitting in a chart room of air base X, I was discussing the future of this home front with an intelligence officer who was assisting in briefing the crews. "See those boys out there," he said, "they are going on the bombing raid tonight—they are going to have something to say about the kind of a world they are going to live in after this war," and you can bet your bottom dollar that that's true.

These boys know, just as we know, that war isn't newspaper headlines or news reels or poems written in Flanders fields. There is nothing romantic about dust and mud and blood. We all know war for the grim, dirty business that it really is. These boys are going to be tremendously interested, just like we are, in preserving the peace. Their voices will be heard from one end of the land to the other—reverberating in the Halls of Congress and echoing around the world. "We want peace," they will say—not a flimsy peace of the moment, but a sound and durable peace—a peace we can rely upon and build upon—a peace which will assure us that our children and our children's children will not be needlessly sacrificed again.

And these boys will know that there are no global roads to peace that do not lead through the United States; that whether we like it or not ours is to be the major part in the great drama of post-war development, and we cannot play our part with vigor unless we are prosperous at home. And I intensely believe that America is on the threshold of her greatest development; that what we have seen in the past is merely a foretaste of the things to come; that the frontiers of science and invention and business are only beginning to be explored; that the frontiers of technological progress created by war are only beginning to be understood; that we are just beginning to build the base of a dynamic America. But to utilize these new frontiers we must preserve and strengthen those things that made America great—the things for which John Paul Jones and Lawrence fought—political democracy, economic opportunity for all, American individualism.

After this war we may find ourselves an island of free enterprise just as after the Revolutionary War we found ourselves an island of democracy, when precept and example prompted much of the rest of the world to follow us. After this war, if we are an island of free enterprise and make it work here, then again by precept and example much of the rest of the world may follow us. For a strong and prosperous America can be of unlimited value in assisting other countries of the world.

For instance, there are many men in America who realize that you can't sell more sewing machines to the Bolivians unless Bolivia has a thriving economy of its own. And

many of us are interested not only in selling sewing machines to Bolivia but in stimulating Bolivian development by Bolivian energy.

For the name of Bolivia you could substitute at least 30 other countries in our modern-day world. They all need an inward impetus upward. Please note that I am not talking about philanthropy. I am not talking about gratuitous expenditures. In country after country that I visited in South America they said, "We want American capital and technological advice, but we have a little capital of our own. We would like your capital and ours to intermingle—to lift us up from economic colonies to countries with economic independencies." I do not fear that kind of talk; I welcome it. The more a country progresses from economic backwardness to economic forwardness, the more it will help. More and better customers all over the world—that's what I want. People who are raising their standard of living by industrialization; people who are trading with other countries; people who are getting more and more prosperous. The American businessman understands this kind of language.

It's only a jump from a bigger and better home town in America to a bigger and better Chungking or Guatemala City, or any other city that can become bigger and better with more people owning their own homes and buying more and more radios and washing machines and refrigerators, and riding around at night in automobiles under bigger and better neon signs.

And does this have nothing to do with peace? I say that it has everything to do with peace. For behind the idea of a bigger and better home town is the vision of a better nation and, somehow, some way, a good world, a good world based upon good localities, a wholesome whole based upon wholesome parts. This will relieve to the skeptical and weary human eye the basis of the sanity of human aspirations everywhere, which is the brotherhood of man.

And thus an America that is strong, prosperous, economically free—an America where economic opportunity is available for all—an America that works for the greater exchange of goods and services with the world—such an America will be the bastion of tomorrow's peace. Upon us there rests tremendous responsibilities—responsibilities for preserving in America those elements that have made us great and strong. For this our Navy throughout its existence has struggled and fought and died. It's the thing for which our Navy today is struggling and fighting and dying. May God give us the strength and the courage and the wisdom to play our part with traditional naval valor in the future.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is now in the Chamber, I desire to propound a request for a unanimous-consent agreement, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that after tomorrow the debate on the pending resolution and amendment be limited, so that no Senator shall speak more than once or more than 15 minutes on the resolution, or 15 minutes on any amendment thereto.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ferguson in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object, let me ask whether the Senator

from Oregon desires to say something at this time?

Mr. McNARY. I wish to determine whether I definitely understand the request. Is the request that after tomorrow, beginning at 12 o'clock tomorrow—at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. After the conclusion of the session tomorrow, after the Senate adjourns or recesses tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. After the adjournment or recess of the session of the Senate tomorrow?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that it is the purpose to have the Senate take a recess or adjourn over until Monday after tomorrow's session.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; until Monday.

Mr. McNARY. Because we do not intend to have a session on Saturday. So the unanimous-consent agreement would apply beginning Monday.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct; beginning Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, am I to understand, then, that beginning Monday at 12 o'clock no Senator would be permitted to speak longer than 15 minutes?

Mr. CONNALLY. Fifteen minutes on the resolution or 15 minutes on any amendment pending.

Mr. McNARY. Fifteen minutes on each?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Which would make 30 minutes on the amendment and on the resolution.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. I have been necessarily detained on some other business, in an adjoining room. Am I to understand that a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate has been suggested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an agreement has been suggested, and is pending at the present moment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I would object to consideration at this time of a unanimous-consent agreement which would operate to limit my explanation of the pending question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say in all kindness that the Senator from Connecticut cannot explain it very well if he is going to stay in an adjoining room. I do not press the matter, if the Senator is going to object.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the Senator from New Mexico stated whether the requested unanimous-consent agreement is agreeable to him?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I know of several other Senators who desire to speak on the pending question.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I was about to request their presence. I think a quorum should be present, so as to have in the Chamber the Senators who may desire to speak on the pending question.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. Let me inquire how the Senator personally feels about the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HATCH. Personally, I do not feel there should be a limitation of debate at this particular time. Later I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Texas, but I doubt the wisdom of such limitation at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Then, the Senator would not permit the acceptance of the proposal?

Mr. HATCH. Certainly not, without having a quorum present, so that I could consult with other Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not see any sense in having a quorum present at this time if the Senator is going to object, anyway.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Has objection been heard to the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. From two sources.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not objected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. President, I did not expect to obtain unanimous consent at this time, but I simply desire to say to Senators that I expect to renew the request at a later date.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate proceed to consider the Executive Calendar.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon have anything to submit? Is there anything further?

Mr. McNARY. That is all.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 28 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

PENNSYLVANIA

Marjorie Lowery, Boston.
Amidee T. Seese, Markleysburg.
Emma J. Roof, Monroeton.
Harry C. Mickie, New Paris.
Esther Smith, Renton.
Alice B. Smith, Shawnee on Delaware.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend George H. Moore, pastor of the Main Street Baptist Church, Greenwood, S. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we come to Thee because Thou hast invited us to come boldly to a throne of grace and find grace to help in time of need. We are ever in need of Thee. We come now asking for wisdom from above. We would not lean upon our own understanding, but lean upon the One who is omnipotent, omniscient, who knows the end from the beginning.

We pray that Thou wilt bless this Nation. May the leaders look to Thee and follow Thee—may all Thy people humble themselves, pray, turn from wicked ways and seek Thy face, so that Thou canst bless. Make us a truly Christian nation, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Make us an instrument through which Thou canst bless the world.

In this world of strife, bloodshed, and hatred, may the nations come to know that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Turn the hearts of the people to Thee, that there may be peace.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include an address given by Mrs. R. M. Kiefer, secretary-manager, National Association of Retail Grocers at the National Food Conference, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., September 17, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LET US INVESTIGATE BEFORE WE TAX

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, let us investigate our Federal Bureaus, find out which are needed, and which are not needed—how many people can be removed from the Federal pay roll, without hindering our war effort—determine how much money is absolutely needed, before we burden the people with addi-

tional taxes, and pour more money into the Federal Treasury. Experience has proven to me, that if you give Federal bureaus and departments the money, they will spend it. So, let us see if they actually need any more money and if so, how much. A few months ago, the President said, we had to have \$16,000,000,000 more revenue—a few weeks ago, \$12,000,000,000—a few days ago, his spokesman, Secretary Morgenthau said, \$10,500,000,000. So let us wait a few more weeks, and investigate, and probably we will not need any more. I believe that reduction in our expenditures, without hindering our war effort, can be made and should be made. May I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to just a few of our expenditures. Travel cost for the executive branch alone—not including the War and Navy Departments—for 1943 will exceed \$100,000,000.

The O. W. I.—Office of War Information—will require better than \$50,000,000 this year to maintain their program—for what—hindering the press—suppressing one of our freedoms? The functions of this Bureau can be handled by our military departments, who would see to it, that nothing of military value to our enemy would be made public. The American people do not need the O. W. I. propaganda program.

In the last fiscal year the Federal Government spent approximately \$30,000,000—excluding War and Navy Departments—for communication, almost \$8,000,000 was spent for telephone calls alone.

We have 12 regional credit corporations, whose duties duplicate wholly or in part the lending activities of 19 other Federal lending agencies. Why cannot a large part of these agencies be merged to cut out overhead, stop duplication, and save manpower.

One Federal loaning agency alone has 47 State offices, 275 district offices, 2,315 county offices; it employs 15,960 people with an annual pay roll of \$30,000,000. Despite its widespread central offices, this agency alone spent \$28,000,000 in traveling expenses. In other words, this one agency spent enough in traveling expenses to pay coach fare from Washington to San Francisco and return for every one of its employees 18 times a year. This one agency's cost was \$1 for every three it loaned.

The Office of O. P. A. alone issued and requested statistical data on 7,715,229 report forms, excluding rationing forms and instructions. One company estimated such forms and instructions required 132,560 man-hours and \$192,500 to prepare Government-required information.

A conservative estimate would be that 188,000 persons prepare data for the Government, excluding of course, rationing work. I believe that at least 60 percent of these required reports can be eliminated.

The Civil Service Commission frequently sends "experts" to my district, recruiting more employees for the Government's already overcrowded pay roll. These representatives or experts are paid their salaries, plus \$6 a day ex-

penses, plus railroad—Pullman—transportation.

One manufacturer who has just recently signed a contract with the Government, found that in order to fulfill the contract legally, he would have to make out more than 22,000 separate invoices and billings, and that each of those forms would have to be made out with 23 carbon copies, 1 carbon copy to be filed in each of the 23 different Government agencies. That means that 23 different file clerks must file the same invoice in 23 duplicate files; 23 Government clerks must go through the same duplicating procedure of reading and digesting the information thereon. All that, at a time when the newspapers of the Nation are being cut down in the size of the newspapers they are allowed to print because of a paper shortage, and all that at a time when we are hearing from every side about the critical manpower shortage.

It is not my desire to prevent the necessary departments from having everything they need to carry on the war; but inefficiency and waste has never yet won a war. There definitely is a tremendous amount of waste and unnecessary expenditure, and the production and purchase of unnecessary goods, and the hiring of thousands of totally unnecessary people in our Government agencies. Why is it that the United States is spending more money on this war than all of our allies combined? Why this swarm of Federal employees, these unnecessary rules and expenditures which are increasing our taxes, while we preach economy and sacrifice?

The people are willing to pay for every gun, every bullet, every plane, bomb, tank, cargo vessel, and warship, and all the food needed to supply our troops, and anything else that is needed, and to provide our share of the supplies to our allies. We are ready to spend any amount of money actually needed to save a single life or shorten the war one minute, but we want these expenditures to be based upon actual needs, and not upon mere unfounded recommendations.

I agree with the President, when he said that "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man, woman, and child who labors." But, we as a people, should not be made victims of such extravagance as we now have, which calls for unnecessary taxation. I, therefore, call upon the President, the leaders of this administration, and every Member of Congress, to exert every conscientious effort to save the requested \$10,500,000,000, instead of directing energies toward plans calling for additional tax burdens to be placed upon our American citizenry. Let us again reflect the thrift and common sense of our forefathers who founded this country. Let us all be champions of economy and good judgment, and enemies of extravagance and waste.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had today to address the House for 10 minutes may be extended to 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from a resolution passed by the Mississippi Valley Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a resolution of the Mississippi Valley Association on the subject of aviation and in the other to include an article which appeared in the local papers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix on two subjects, to include in one an editorial that appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., on Monday, October 25, 1943, and in the other to include a resolution submitted by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission adopted at the annual meeting held at Philadelphia, Pa., on September 23 and 24, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address made by me on October 4.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent address by the Honorable Sumner Welles before a meeting of the Foreign Policy Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, since obtaining unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which I prepared on the work of Carlos Finlay, I have obtained an estimate from the Public Printer advising me that it would make three and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of \$157.50. I therefore renew my unanimous-consent request at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and to include therein a letter and certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a resolution I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders previously entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes, and following that, that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and, another request, that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by David Lawrence under date of October 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, if the House is in session, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OIL

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, oil is the lifeblood of the whole military machine of this country and every other country.

Oil is an exhaustible resource.

Possession of oil reserves and oil resources on the one hand—or the lack of them on the other—may fundamentally influence the course of history and the position of the nations in the future. Control of the petroleum industry within this Nation constitutes something mighty close to supreme economic power.

Yet no natural resource has ever been more effectively controlled by powerful monopolistic interests than the oil of our own country. Those interests have through the years largely "written their own ticket" so far as their relationship to the Government and people of the United States has been concerned. Times have not changed.

ELK HILLS

Five months ago some of us spoke out in protest against the contract entered into the previous November between the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co. of California with regard to the Elk Hills naval oil reserve. Under the terms of that contract the Navy could have obtained not one drop of its own oil from its own reserve as long as the war lasted—or for 5 years, whichever was longer—without buying it from the Standard Oil Co. It is not my purpose today to review the arguments or the events which led to the cancellation of that contract only a few days after the first public protest against it was made here in the House on May 21, 1943. Suffice it to say the contract was canceled. For the reasons for that cancellation I refer you to the unrefuted testimony of Assistant Attorney General Norman Littell before the Public Lands Committee.

But the fundamental issue and question of policy with regard to Elk Hills reserve has not been decided. Standard Oil of California is still operating the field under an interim agreement with the Navy Department. That agreement became effective September 8 and runs for 90 days, which means that before December 7 the permanent policy with regard to this, the greatest oil reserve on earth, save only one, must be decided.

Standard Oil owns about one-third of the Elk Hills field. That third has been heavily drilled and exploited. The people of the United States, and specifically the Navy, own the other two-thirds of the field, including the portion least exploited. The problem has been to conserve the Navy's oil so as to assure, so far as possible, the supply for future defense of our country. But this has been impossible so long as Standard's wells drilled along the borders of Navy's section continued to draw the oil from those sections.

Two general courses can be followed. Either the whole Elk Hills reserve can be turned over to the Standard Oil Co. which owns one-third of it, to be operated under the terms of some sort of contract, or else the one-third holdings of the Standard Oil Co. can be purchased by the Navy which owns the two-thirds, and the whole field made into the real oil reserve which it ought to be and which Congress intended it to be.

This is the greatest oil reserve, so far as we know, that our Navy has or ever can have. It ought to be managed as a true reserve. That simply cannot be done unless it belongs to the Navy—the whole of it.

The signing of a contract giving Standard Oil a monopoly of exploitation and development and operation of this field is apparently the only other alternative. If such a contract were anything like the original one, the advantages to the oil company and the possible loss to the American people would be enormous. And the whole reserve would be subject to the chance that a long succession of Secretaries of the Navy would be wise, resourceful, and incorruptible enough to keep abreast of one of the two or three tightest, most powerful organizations of any sort—political, military, religious, or industrial—that the world has ever seen.

Never in my discussion of this question have I suggested that there was any lack of honor or honesty or good faith on anyone's part. I do not do so now.

But I cannot fail to warn the Congress and the Nation that the danger is not past of another contract being made which will pass the test of technical legality—which the original one did not—but which will deliver Elk Hills over to the Standard Oil's operation and control just the same.

Oil in the ground is a gift of God to the American people—to the whole people. Elk Hills ought to belong, in toto, to the American people. The Navy ought to purchase, by condemnation if necessary, the holdings of Standard Oil in that field. For that is the only way it can protect the oil it already owns under its own land. No other solution is fair to the American people. None other can protect their future. This Congress ought to require such a policy to be followed.

Our Navy Department has acquired close to a million acres of land since the war began. I do not criticize these acquisitions, believing them to have been made due to the necessity of the war program in the defense of our country. It appears, however, that the largest amount of land acquired in any single State has been in California. A considerable portion of the water front in the city of Oakland was acquired by the Navy Department, and other pieces of land, in some cases very large ones, have been acquired for such purposes as ship facilities, naval air stations, housing, the construction of roads, the building of ammunition depots, sewage disposal, water supply, and access rail and power lines. My only question is, If it was fit-

ting and proper, as I believe it was, for our Navy to acquire these holdings of land, why should we hesitate when we are confronted by that admittedly formidable organization, the Standard Oil Co. of California?

Only when the whole Elk Hills field belongs to the American people through their Navy will the Navy's one greatest reserve of its lifeblood—oil—be secure.

DIRECTIVE NO. 70

I now come to a discussion of Petroleum Directive No. 70 issued by the Petroleum Administration for War under date of September 24, 1943, and published in the Federal Register for Wednesday, October 13, on page 13983.

Very little public discussion has been had of this directive. I do not believe it has been mentioned at all in the Congress and only one newspaper so far as I am aware has carried any considerable discussion of it.

The O. W. I., for example, made only the following brief mention of Directive No. 70:

Foreign operations of American oil companies during the war emergency will be more completely coordinated under the terms of Petroleum Directive No. 70 issued today by Petroleum Administrator for War Ickes.

The many important considerations to the future of the American oil industry and, indeed, the American people as a whole which were omitted by this O. W. I. announcement will be clear as I go along.

Under the terms of this directive, the Foreign Operations Committee of the Petroleum Administration for War is given the power to investigate and determine the petroleum requirements of each foreign country or area to be supplied and to prepare and submit to the Director allocation schedules for each such country or area. This committee is also empowered to allocate the foreign supply among the suppliers and importers in each area or country to be served. The committee is likewise empowered to prepare "adequate and detailed supply and import-allocation schedules covering the importation of petroleum into the United States and shall submit such schedules to the Director."

This committee can adjust among suppliers or importers differences between estimates and actual supplies of petroleum allocated and shipped. It can arrange with the War Shipping Administration for vessel tonnage to carry out its schedules of the movement of petroleum. The committee is directed to coordinate its activities with the British Overseas Supply Committee and such other committees or agencies as may be established by the Government of the United States or any of its Allies or friendly nations.

In short, this committee is empowered to determine how much oil each country will get and through exactly what companies it will receive it. It is also empowered to determine just how much oil this country is to import and through what companies we can import it.

Any person who is affected by any of the action of this committee or who thinks that he will be injured by comply-

ing with any of its schedules or plans can appeal to the Director of the Foreign Operations Committee of the Petroleum Administration for War and from that Director can appeal to the Petroleum Administrator for War. But that is as far as he can go, the decision of the Petroleum Administrator being absolutely final.

It is provided in this directive that plans or schedules developed by this committee shall become effective upon approval by the chief counsel of the Petroleum Administration for War and upon being issued either by the Petroleum Administrator or the Deputy Petroleum Administrator.

Now, it is obvious that the most sweeping powers have been granted to this committee. Their plans and schedules will be approved either by Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator, or by his Deputy Administrator, who happens to be Mr. Davies, the vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

As a practical matter, of course, the Petroleum Administrator, Mr. Ickes, the only bona fide governmental official in this whole picture that I can discover, is also Secretary of the Interior and has many other extremely important duties which, by the way, he has discharged with efficiency and faithfulness through the years. In the very nature of the case, however, it is obvious that what will practically happen is that the plans and schedules of the Foreign Operations Committee will be approved by his deputy, Mr. Davies, of the Standard Oil Co. of California, in most instances.

The chief counsel of the Petroleum Administration for War, who also has to give approval of such plans and schedules, is Mr. Howard Marshall. Mr. Marshall, like Mr. Davies, has been for years an official of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

It will be interesting to note here the names of the men who compose this Foreign Operations Committee, and I submit them herewith:

Orville Harden, Standard Oil of New Jersey, chairman.

J. A. Brown, of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.

Robert H. Colley, Atlantic Refining Co.

H. M. Herron, California-Texas Oil Co.

H. D. Collier, Standard Oil of California.

J. F. Drake, Gulf Oil Corporation.

Ralph W. Gallagher, Standard Oil of New Jersey.

W. F. Humphrey, Tidewater Associated Oil Co.

W. Alton Jones, Cities Service Co.

P. W. Parker, Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.

W. S. S. Rodgers, Texas Corporation.

H. F. Sinclair, Consolidated Oil Corporation.

W. L. Stewart, Jr., Union Oil Co. of California.

I am not questioning at all the patriotism or good faith of these gentlemen, but it is perfectly obvious that the major oil companies completely and wholly dominate this committee.

It will be seen that the major oil companies completely and wholly dominate

this committee. With one possible exception there is not a man on it who can by any stretch of the imagination be considered to represent any other interest than the major oil companies.

Another paragraph from the directive reads as follows:

The Foreign Operations Committee and its committees shall maintain such staff and appoint such persons as may be necessary or requisite to discharge the responsibilities, duties, and functions under this directive. Operation expenses of all such committees shall be made from a fund to which voluntary contribution may be made by persons engaged in the petroleum industry and such funds may be solicited by the Foreign Operations Committee.

In other words, Congress is effectively bypassed in this whole proposition. There will be no necessity of coming to Congress for any money to support the operations of this committee and hence no opportunity for review of its work whatsoever here on Capitol Hill. This committee can control the movement of oil all over the world, make arrangements and agreements with companies in other countries, and even apparently with their governments. It can control all shipments into the United States. And there is no way provided at all whereby public knowledge can be had of what it does or why it does it.

Most important of all, it seems to me, provision has been made in this directive for the invoking of section 12 of Public Law 603 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, whereby with the approval of the head of the War Production Board all antitrust laws can be set aside with regard to any action taken by this committee. Here we have the greatest charter of power, in my opinion, ever given to a group of essentially private citizens, directly connected with the most powerful natural-resource monopoly the world has ever known, over the most vital single resource that there is.

I might be somewhat less concerned about Petroleum Directive No. 70 were it not for what has happened heretofore in connection with petroleum directives and their operation. Under Directive No. 59 it was provided that, as to District No. 1, comprising the bulk of the Atlantic seaboard, all importations of petroleum products should be made by "primary suppliers," meaning the major oil companies, in exact proportion to their importations in 1941. This was supposed merely to maintain the same ratio of business between the various oil companies as existed in the past, which is, of course, an understandable thing. However, there is a substantial body of testimony from independent oil companies to the effect that the way this directive has actually worked out has been to prevent them from getting any petroleum products at all.

The question I want to ask with all of the earnestness at my command is this: Are we not witnessing here without any substantial protest on our part the complete cartelization of the oil industry of America under governmental sanction? And does not Directive No. 70 lay a perfect groundwork for the extension of this

process into the international field so that there is being developed a perfect framework for an international oil cartel more powerful than anything we have ever known before?

Mr. Speaker, I have not the slightest intention of putting preservation of the antitrust laws ahead of any consideration which is necessary to the winning of the war, but I cannot help wondering, especially in view of other events that have taken place in recent years in this particular industry, whether it is really necessary to suspend the antitrust laws in this instance or whether it is only a change fondly to be desired by the major oil companies. Neither do I question the patriotism or integrity of the men composing this committee or the officials of the Office of the Petroleum Administration for War. But I do know that habits of thought developed through long years of business experience are hard to change. I know that the whole philosophy of those who have fought to control production and price of things vital to our economy, is to reduce competition to a minimum if not to eliminate it completely.

In war, coordination of our economic efforts is, of course, essential, but what safeguards are included in this directive or anywhere else against the perpetuity of the inevitable monopolistic control which it has created into the post-war period? What chance will there be that the American Government itself can cope with the colossus of industrial power that will be here represented, and more especially what chance will there be for the protection of the public interest by means of any effective competition from truly independent concerns whatsoever?

Already a corporation named "War Emergency Tankers Incorporated" has been formed which controls the operation of all of the oil tankers available to our country so far as I know. All the stock of this corporation is held by the major oil companies. They are operating these tankers already, but have made, I am informed, verbal agreement with the Government that they will not profiteer as a result of this monopolistic control over the entire fleet of tankers.

As to the operation of these tankers by the major oil companies under this interesting arrangement, there is provision also for suspension of the antitrust laws. And Mr. Wilson, as acting head of the War Production Board, is officially recorded in the Federal Register as having agreed to suspension of the antitrust laws in order to allow the operation of War Emergency Tankers, Inc., to proceed unimpeded by any such consideration. And it is important to observe, I think, that as a practical matter, the War Production Board officials are far too busy to call in question requests on the part of the Petroleum Administration for suspension of the antitrust laws. Nor contrary to a widely held opinion in Congress, is the approval of the Department of Justice required. All that is required under the language of Public Law 603 is that the Attorney General shall have seen the order for suspension of the anti-

trust laws before it is issued. He does not, however, have to approve it in order for it to go into effect.

Perhaps some such committee as this was necessary, Mr. Speaker. I do not know. But off hand it would seem to me that the War Shipping Administration has ample power to direct the movement of all types of ships throughout the world and to make them available wherever needed.

Even granting, Mr. Speaker, that this extreme concentration of control over the oil industry of the world is necessary as a war measure, we are certainly justified in bringing up the question as to what agencies and persons shall be entrusted with bringing it about. Why, for example, are not the independent oil companies given some real representation on these boards and commissions? Why, in the second place, is there not at least one representative of the public without any other arduous duties on his shoulders placed on every one of these committees in order that the people may at least be informed of what is going on? Why indeed is not Congress asked to pass legislation specifically defining the powers of these groups of major oil company representatives who are being clothed so rapidly with supergovernmental powers? And finally, why, if Congress is not asked to do this, does it not on its own motion insist upon doing it?

In any case it is my firm conviction that the Congress should inquire very profoundly and I would add continuously into the activities not only of the Foreign Operations Committee, but of this entire interlocking directorate of major oil-company executives who now hold in their hands the key to the industrial and military future of our country—namely, petroleum.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. The Pan-American and California Standard Oil Co., I understand, has a concession from Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia, that comprises 250,000 square miles in that country. Has the gentleman made any exploration and inquiry as to what the conditions were that our Government, our State Department, or any officials of our Government, gave in Saudi Arabia, for those concessions, with reference particularly to Palestine? I understand that Ibn Saud has denied the purposes of the Balfour Declaration and resolutions adopted by this Congress. He has sought to have the British Colonial Office violate solemn treaties entered into with this Government with reference to immigration into Palestine. Has the gentleman any knowledge as to whether or not there is any connection between these cartels of which he speaks with reference to oil in the Levant and what these Arabs are trying to do with reference to the destiny of Palestine?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No. I may say to the gentleman that I know something about that huge amount of oil that is in Arabia, but I did not speak about it today for the reason that I do

not feel that I know enough about it, and I did not feel prepared at this time to do it. I would rather not comment on it for that reason.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Northwest Farm News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with sugar, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article on farm friends and friends of the farmer by A. G. Pace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CEILING PRICE ON COTTON

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are two special orders outstanding for later today. If these gentlemen will yield to me, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection on the part of either of the gentlemen who have special orders following the one just finished, the gentleman may proceed for 3 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have just left my bewildered constituents—I have just hurried here from a State faced with a needless agricultural catastrophe.

When I left here a few weeks ago to return home to start my campaign for the Governorship of Louisiana this body was hard at work expediting the successful prosecution of war, and the people of Louisiana were backing up our armed efforts to the limit of their wealth and productive ability. Our farmers working short-handed and with patched-up equipment were bringing in cotton and other crops and responding to the Nation's demands for their fullest possible production. There is this year little money in the farm homes of America that is not divided between War bond commitments and the bare necessities for life and farming. The farm income is something that we now are studying, and the necessity of raising it we view with such importance that the granting of subsidies is under serious considera-

tion. And yet in the face of this fact, in the midst of the most perilous times, like a bolt from the sky without warning, comes an act against the farmers of the South.

A little handful of men in New York City, who probably never saw a bale of cotton or a single one of the millions of acres of cotton land of the South, have decided to put a ceiling on the price the farmer can get for his cotton. A fixed price on a farm commodity that has no fixed cost. This by and from a special clique of men who own no cotton and grow not one bale of cotton and probably would not be able to tell the difference between a bale of cotton and a bale of hay. Yet these are the men who have decided and so decreed that whatever the tides and fortunes of war, if loss is to be incurred in the commodity market it will be by the farmers and not by a special group of gamblers and speculators of the New York Cotton Exchange.

A Congress in this very Chamber enacted into law measures designed to protect the people of this Nation against such acts as has been committed by the willful, vicious, self-centered small group of large interests that control the New York Cotton Exchange. What happened seems to be quite clear. These men obviously misjudged the market and rather than take the losses of their gambling choose to welch on their contract to the detriment and loss of thousands of hard-working cotton farmers of the South. As the eminent Tom Linder, of Georgia, says, "The Government is holding the farmer while the gamblers skin him."

Already, Mr. Speaker, the far-reaching implications of this act have brought a storm of protest. In fact so adverse has been the criticism that the president of the New York Cotton Exchange has found it necessary to issue a series of bulletins and letters attempting to support and justify their position. It is hard to believe that the all-highest board of managers of the New York Cotton Exchange have heard the anguished cries of thousands of farmers, but something has provoked a hurried alibi and a makeshift defense for their nefarious act and they have begun to cry, "The war did it, not us."

In a confidential letter to his members dated October 23, Mr. Eric Alliot outlines the position whereby 15 men have taken a stand against the thousands of cotton farmers of the South. A stand that was devised behind closed doors, planned in secrecy, and delivered as one of the most effective blows against the morale of a sizable portion of the people of this Nation yet delivered in this war. Cotton ceiling day, October 13, may well be another Pearl Harbor for the farmers of the South if swift action is not taken against these 15 men.

There is much of interest in this letter from Mr. Eric Alliot, leader of the 15 men, that will warrant close scrutiny. For instance, they elected to welch on the October contracts and cited contracts of September 13 as "a day of congestion," and many will ask "what was the matter with that particular day, were not those contracts just as good as the

ones made on the previous trading day, September 11, or the day after, September 14? Or is the better question whose contracts caused the congestion—who bought and who sold these contracts and who is protecting who?"

In this same letter Mr. Alliot says that it was done to prevent price distortion—what he must mean by price distortion is no price movement that would be favorable to the farmers and cost his gambling friends money. Again Mr. Alliot says the act followed "careful consideration of all the facts," and, I might add, a quick look at their own bank balances. Again Mr. Alliot said, "the action was taken with due regard for the rights of all concerned." I question this and defy him to name a single farmer or merchant whom he consulted.

Reduced to terms of money, the ceiling price arbitrarily placed 75 cents a bale below the prevailing market price meant a loss of 75 cents a bale for the farmers and an immediate profit of 75 cents a bale for the gamblers—a profit for the gamblers on something they did not own against the farmer's loss on something he did own.

Ultimately this action—the placing of a ceiling on cotton—rolling onward like a wave of economic destruction, broke the market an additional \$2 a bale—making the total loss by this action \$2.75 per bale, a total of \$55,000,000 loss in the value of the visible supply of cotton. For those of you not from the South, let me tell you that the visible supply of cotton in the country is approximately 20,000,000 bales. Therefore this original "ceiling day" 75 cents a bale taken away from the farmer meant a loss to the working people of the South of approximately \$15,000,000. Add this to the depreciation of the market caused by this demoralizing action and you have the simple fact that 15 men have reduced the value of the Nation's cotton by \$55,000,000, not one cent of which they could or can spare.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, Who are these 15 men who take into their own hands the Bill of Rights and dare to destroy the property value of the most important commodity produced in this country? This, Mr. Speaker, is an action far beyond any that Congress has seen fit to take. Who is this ring leader, this willful gambler, this captain of the band of 15 men who have visited such catastrophe upon our people? Is it possible to get him before a committee of our members for explanations of his acts? The results are so clear and so visibly a violation of the best interests of the Nation that he already stands condemned and found guilty. Or is this leader an untouchable—and is the remedy the simple clean out and the removal of the gambling casino in New York known as the New York Cotton Exchange?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a short editorial, and in the other to include a poem on the question of saving human lives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a communication I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FARM PRICES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with no desire of criticizing any individual that I rise to point out the erroneous implications that are contained in the letter of October 19, addressed by Hon. Prentiss Brown, the recently resigned Director of the Office of Price Administration, to the President, which letter was inserted on page 8776 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my able and outstanding colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. My concern in this regard grows out of the fact that the statements I refer to are all calculated to encourage the widespread misconception that farmers as a class are enjoying a disproportionately large share of the increased national income, and that unconscionably high farm prices are contributing materially to an unduly high level of food prices.

Mr. Speaker, too many people in more or less responsible positions have encouraged this misleading belief. I cannot, therefore, sit idly by and allow the figures in Mr. Brown's letter to go unchallenged. No matter how innocent he may be of any conscious effort to mislead, his statement does in fact mislead, and does create an unfair and unjust resentment against farmers in the minds of those who read it and accept it as true. I realize full well that my remarks will not receive the widespread publicity accorded those of Mr. Brown. I realize that it is perfectly natural for those who read Mr. Brown's statement and my statement, to say to themselves and, indeed, to their associates, "Mr. Brown was in a better position to know the facts than that country Congressman from Texas." I have, therefore, brought with me and today hold in my hand the very publication from which Mr. Brown quoted that at least those of my colleagues who are here can see for themselves that I am correctly stating the facts.

Mr. Brown took proper credit for checking the upward trend in the cost of living, but he erroneously tried to show that the selfishness of farmers was the greatest obstacle to his efforts. Specifically his letter says:

The upward trend in the cost of living has been definitely arrested.

He then cites figures for different dates. Then he continues—I again quote:

It is interesting to note the comparison of the wholesale prices of 1 year ago and those of today as contained in the New York Times commodity price index. The October 17 issue

shows that the increases are mainly in those items such as wheat, corn, oats, and barley, where either we did not have authority to act by reason of the parity limitations or the commodity had only recently reached parity. A few outstanding examples of the solidity of price control are as follows.

Here follows a tabulation of various commodities such as iron, steel, copper, cotton print cloth, gas, and crude oil, all of which are shown to be selling at the same price on October 16, 1943, as on October 17, 1942. The only items listed in this tabulation which were included in the above paragraph from which I have quoted are wheat and corn, both of which are shown, in keeping with the idea that the farmer is causing inflation, to have advanced in price very materially. Mr. Brown's letter lists the price of wheat as of October 16, 1943, at \$1.93½ per bushel and of corn on the same date at \$1.21½ per bushel.

Now, I have no objection to Mr. Brown stating that the price of wheat has advanced. It has. It was woefully low—far below parity a year ago. But I do object most strenuously when Mr. Brown or Mr. White or Mr. Black leads the people of the United States to believe that any farmer in the United States can get \$1.90 for his wheat. The prices he quoted are alleged to be the New York City prices. Unfortunately for both farmers and producers, the yield of wheat on Times Square has been notoriously low for many years. No farmer gets any such price as Mr. Brown has mentioned, and that there may be no charge that I am not willing to back my words with my acts, I have a little wheat in Texas. I here and now offer it to Mr. Brown or anyone else who has tried to place the odium of excessive food prices on the farmer at \$1.64½ per bushel. That is considerably more than I can get for it, but it is 30 cents per bushel less than Mr. Brown says it is worth.

Now, do not all of you run up here with your certified checks to take my wheat.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas. I hope he wants to take my wheat at 30 cents less than Mr. Brown says it is worth.

Mr. HOPE. I call the attention of the gentleman also to the fact that at the time those farmers sold their wheat in his country and in mine the price was at least 25 cents a bushel less than it is today.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. We sold wheat for just about a dollar in my country. We harvested a little before you did.

The truth is that wheat is generally quoted at one of the terminal markets and all of these terminal markets are higher than the price the farmer gets, but let us see just what the very issue of the New York Times, which Mr. Brown quotes, says. I have the business and financial section of that issue of the New York Times in my hand. On page 12 of section 5 of the issue of October 17, 1943, we find an article headed "Commodity index study." The article bears a Washington date line of October 16. It

quotes from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It says:

The following table shows specific commodities by actual selling price.

It lists Kansas City wheat at \$1.51½ and Minneapolis wheat at \$1.46½—a little discrepancy of between .40 and .50 as compared with Mr. Brown's figures. The same article gives the price of corn at \$1.06, not \$1.21 as listed in Mr. Brown's article. And these figures are admittedly terminal market prices, not farm prices. I submit that the use of such misleading figures could only be intended to give an unfair picture of farm income.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and I am glad that he is giving this valuable information to the House. I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Brown's O. P. A. organization has placed a ceiling of \$1.07 on corn at Chicago which means from 90 to 95 cents on the farm. Apparently he does not have much confidence in the ability of his own ceilings to hold.

Mr. POAGE. Apparently his ceilings have been working better in the farmers' areas than they have in the consumers' areas, because we have been getting only below the ceiling price.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know the gentleman does not want to do Mr. Brown an injustice. I had understood that this was perhaps a typographical error in Mr. Brown's statement. I wonder if the gentleman has called Mr. Brown's office to see if that is not the case.

Mr. POAGE. No; because regardless of whether or not it is a typographical error—and I do not know that it is an error—I certainly would not suggest that these may not be the prices that Mr. Brown found in some bank in New York. I do not mean to suggest that Mr. Brown has made any misstatement, but he has misled the public. Doubtless these are the prices on Times Square. I do not know what wheat is selling for on Times Square. I do not know what corn is bringing on the Battery. Doubtless these are the prices in New York City. I am not going to discuss that. I am not questioning the truthfulness of Mr. Brown's statement, but I am pointing out that the figures are not the prices that farmers receive. I am pointing out the fact that they are far away from the actual prices the producer gets.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I state that within the last few days I sold some corn from my farm in Minnesota for 91 cents, which is the ceiling in my community.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Brown said it was worth \$1.21 plus. Even the figures I have quoted from the New York Times of the

date Mr. Brown quotes are admittedly the terminal market prices and not the prices on the farm. They obviously are higher than any farmer is receiving. So I submit again that, admitting that Mr. Brown's figures are correct for New York City, they are misleading as giving an untrue picture of what the farmers of this country are receiving.

Now, the vitally important thing is that these or similarly inaccurate figures have undoubtedly been taken as a basis of further calculations whereby Mr. Brown and others connected with the O. P. A. have undertaken to convince the public that the farmer is to blame for most of the increase in the cost of living. In the very next column of his letter Mr. Brown quotes some figures to show that food and raw materials have advanced in price much faster than have manufactured articles. Of course, if you are willing to assume that the farmer can get \$1.90 for \$1.40 wheat, then you can undoubtedly prove that he has received an undue share of national income; but the facts are, as so ably demonstrated by my good friend the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. STEVE PACE, that if we use a fair yardstick, the total income of 29,084,000 farm people last year was but \$15,600,000,000 out of a total national income of \$117,000,000,000. In fact, there is no other large group of our society which receives so small a per capita income even today.

Nor has the price of things farmers sell gone up with anything like the rapidity with which industrial wages have advanced. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the average of all farm prices is today 1.93 percent of the average of these prices during the base period of 1909-14. This is, however, based on all products, not simply 58 selected items which Mr. Brown uses to show that farm prices have advanced more rapidly in this war than in the First World War. As a matter of fact, there can be little doubt that the inclusive calculations of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are actually unfair to farmers in that they give too much weight to certain relatively unimportant crops as compared with the prices of the three great basic crops which make up more than two-thirds of the value of all field crops of the Nation—corn, cotton, and wheat. As a matter of fact, the price of cotton is only 171 percent and the price of grain is only 158 percent of price during the base period. But how much worse—how deliberately unfair—it is when a high official of the O. P. A. picks out 58 unknown crops and uses them as a yardstick to prove that the farmer is getting too much.

Let us get this thing out in the open. Let us call our shots and name our crops. Let us take the big three—the three crops that make up the bulk of the farm income of America. During the base period 1909-14 the average price of corn, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, was 64.2 cents per bushel. Last month, according to the same source, it was \$1.09 per bushel. The price of cotton was 12.4 cents per pound during the base period. Now the price of cotton is 20.2 cents per pound. The

price of wheat was 88.01 cents per bushel during the base period. Now the price of wheat is \$1.30 per bushel. During the same period the average hourly earnings in all manufacturing industries advanced, according to the same source, from 21.16 cents per hour in the base period to 85.3 cents per hour last year. Of course, the actual increase in earnings is considerably larger, as these figures use only the basic hourly wage and take no account of overtime. On the other hand, all the farmer's overtime is included in his price.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. PACE. It so happens that yesterday I checked the average wage of all of the manufacturing establishments of the United States and find that the average now is 96.4 cents per hour.

Mr. POAGE. And that is an increase of 7 cents over what it was a month ago.

Mr. PACE. Ninety-six and four-tenths cents per hour.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman.

The truth is that everybody's income has been going up faster than the farmer's and the result has been that today the laboring man working in our American factories is actually spending a smaller percent of his weekly income for food than ever before in the history of the country. Let us consider the bituminous coal miners. We have been told that they were in about as bad shape as any group of workers. During the base period they earned 31.26 cents per hour. Last year they earned \$1.059 per hour plus overtime. But the miner is interested in the amount of food he can buy with his labor and this is, we must all agree, the final test of the justice of any wage scale or farm price level. What are the facts? From what the miners' union has said, and from what the O. P. A. has intimated, one would naturally suppose that the miner was today working many more hours to earn enough to buy the same scanty diet for himself and family that he earned with fewer hours' work in the past. Such is not the fact. The O. P. A. has singled out butter as a product that has reached such a price level that it has become necessary for the Government to pay a subsidy rather than to let it rise any further. The truth is that just before the subsidy was placed on butter, the bituminous coal miner could buy 3 pounds of butter for 1 hour's work while in the base period he could only buy 1.2 pounds of butter with the proceeds of 1 hour's work. So it is all down the line. Those engaged in industrial work are almost without exception able to buy more of the products of the farm in exchange for fewer hours of labor than ever before.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the colleague of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is in favor of increasing the price of crude oil in order to have more oil produced. I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in that regard, and I believe also that the Speaker of the House agrees with him.

Mr. POAGE. I agree with that part of Mr. PATMAN's philosophy, but not with that false part of his position which would deny to the farmer a fair price for his products, and try to make it up out of subsidies from the Public Treasury.

Mr. MUNDT. Correct. I am also in disagreement with the gentleman's colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in that particular. I rose simply to say that if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] would apply the same formula to the farmer that he wants to apply to the oil producer, we could have sufficient oil and proper prices for the farmer's products.

Mr. POAGE. Unquestionably, and I would apply the same formula to the oil producer and the farmer, and that is the formula that we have applied to those engaged in war work and those who have received war contracts, but we have not been able to get any such thing for the farmer or the oil producer. That would simply apply the American doctrine of fair play and equal treatment all along the line.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want the laborer's toil to buy less than the farmer's, but neither do I think it just to ask the farmer to continue to toil to earn an unduly small share of the national income. It seems to me to be clear. The thing we should determine is: Does the farmer demand of the industrial worker and the city dweller, and does the farmer require that the laborer and the city dweller pay the wage earned from an unreasonably large number of units of labor in exchange for the farm products he buys. And in this determination, we should not assume, as does Mr. Brown, that the farmer gets \$1.94 for wheat. Let it be remembered that the farmer only gets the farm price—not the delivered price. Let it be remembered that in many cases, if not in most cases, the labor, transportation, and processing costs of the farm products that the consumer buys greatly exceed the prices the farmer receives. The shirt I am wearing cost \$2.50. It does not have 12½ cents' worth of cotton in it and yet most consumers attribute the increase in the cost of clothes to the alleged avarice of the cotton farmer and the sheep grower. Even the loaf of bread that you buy has less than 2 cents' worth of wheat figured at Mr. Brown's figures.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer is not responsible for the increase in the cost of living. He has received a relatively small increase in his prices when compared with the very groups that still come before our people and arrogantly threaten to strike and do strike when their wages are not increased. The farmer's costs of production have advanced very rapidly. He must have higher prices, or he cannot produce. Note, Mr. Speaker, I did not say "will not" produce. I said "cannot." There is a vast difference. Farming is an operation that requires equipment. That equipment is not going to be forthcoming from the factories unless the farmer can pay. He has nothing with which to pay except with the sale price of his farm products.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert three tables prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and by the Bureau of Labor Sta-

tistics very shortly before the so-called roll-back subsidies broke the market for some of the farmers' most important products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Estimated amount of respective farm products that could be purchased with average earnings from 1 hour's labor in selected industries, 1909-13 average and 1942

Industry	Cotton, pounds		Wheat, pounds		Corn, pounds		Dry edible beans, pounds		Potatoes, pounds		Peanuts, pounds		Rice, pounds	
	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942
All manufacturing.....	1.7	4.5	14.4	47.9	18.4	53.0	6.3	16.4	18.2	44.2	4.4	14.3	11.7	23.8
Cotton manufacturing.....	1.2	2.9	9.8	30.3	12.5	33.5	4.3	10.4	12.4	28.0	3.0	9.0	7.9	15.1
Iron and steel.....	2.3	5.0	19.4	52.8	24.9	58.3	8.5	18.0	24.6	48.7	6.0	15.7	15.8	26.2
Woolen.....	1.4	3.9	11.6	41.9	14.9	46.3	5.1	14.3	14.8	38.7	3.6	12.5	9.5	20.8
Bituminous coal.....	2.5	5.6	21.3	59.5	27.2	65.8	9.3	20.3	26.9	54.9	6.5	17.7	17.3	29.6
Clothing.....	1.8	3.5	15.5	37.0	19.8	40.9	6.8	12.6	19.6	34.1	4.7	11.0	12.6	18.4
Slaughtering and meat packing.....	1.6	4.3	13.1	45.3	16.8	50.1	5.7	15.5	16.6	41.8	4.0	13.5	10.7	22.5
Boots and shoes.....	1.9	3.5	15.6	36.9	20.0	40.7	6.8	12.6	19.8	34.0	4.8	11.0	12.7	18.3
Lumber (sawmills).....	1.6	3.4	13.1	35.7	16.7	39.4	5.7	12.2	16.6	32.9	4.0	10.6	10.6	17.7
Hosiery and knit goods.....	1.3	3.1	10.7	33.1	13.6	36.6	4.6	11.3	13.5	30.6	3.3	9.9	8.7	16.5

Industry	Tobacco, pounds		Hogs, pounds		Beef cattle, pounds		Butter, pounds		Milk, pounds		Eggs, dozens		Chickens, pounds	
	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942
All manufacturing.....	2.1	2.4	2.9	6.5	3.9	8.0	0.8	2.4	13.2	33.2	1.0	2.9	1.9	4.5
Cotton manufacturing.....	1.4	1.5	2.0	4.1	2.6	5.1	.6	1.5	9.0	21.0	.7	1.8	1.3	2.9
Iron and steel.....	2.9	2.6	3.9	7.2	5.3	8.8	1.1	2.7	17.9	36.5	1.3	3.1	2.5	5.0
Woolens.....	1.7	2.1	2.4	5.7	3.2	7.0	.7	2.1	10.7	29.0	.8	2.5	1.5	3.9
Bituminous coal.....	3.1	2.9	4.3	8.1	5.8	10.0	1.2	3.0	19.5	41.2	1.5	3.5	2.7	5.6
Clothing.....	2.3	1.8	3.1	5.1	4.2	6.2	.9	1.9	14.2	25.6	1.1	2.2	2.0	3.5
Slaughtering and meat packing.....	1.9	2.2	2.7	6.2	3.6	7.6	.8	2.3	12.0	31.4	.9	2.7	1.7	4.3
Boots and shoes.....	2.3	1.8	3.2	5.0	4.2	6.2	.9	1.9	14.4	25.5	1.1	2.2	2.0	3.5
Lumber (sawmills).....	1.9	1.8	2.6	4.9	3.5	6.0	.8	1.8	12.0	24.7	.9	2.1	1.7	3.4
Hosiery and knit goods.....	1.6	1.6	2.2	4.5	2.9	5.6	.6	1.7	9.8	23.0	.7	2.0	1.4	3.1

Source: The computations are based on (1) prices received by farmers as published by the U. S. Department of Agriculture; (2) hourly earnings as reported in Real Wages in the United States, 1890-1926, by Paul Douglas, for the 1909-14 average (with some series adjusted to the Bureau of Labor Statistics level); and (3) 1942 hourly earnings as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Farm prices are those received by farmers for the period August 1909 to July 1914 and the season average for 1942. The 5-year average for hourly earnings is the calendar years 1910-14.

Quantities of farm products required to purchase specified commodities, United States, 1910-14 and 1942

Commodity	Unit	1910-14	1942
Grain binder, 7-foot.....	Bushel of wheat...	156.1	280.9
Corn planter, 2-row.....	Bushel of corn.....	66.0	118.4
Cream separator.....	Pound of butterfat.....	263.1	239.0
Overalls.....	Pound of cotton.....	7.1	9.5
Cultivator, 1-horse.....	do.....	38.5	49.7
Shoes, work.....	Pound of beef cattle.....	40.2	31.0
Hoe, 7-inch blade.....	Pound of cotton.....	3.9	5.2

¹ 250-quart capacity, 1910-14; 500-pound capacity, 1942.

² Shoes brogans, 1910-14; shoes, work, 1942.

³ Hoes, each, 1910-14; hoes, 7-inch blade, 1942.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have previously presented these figures to the Congress. As I pointed out at that time, I did not make these tables. I am not responsible for the conditions that created these figures; neither are the farms of this country. We did not even collect the figures. We do not claim to be economists, but I know, and the farmers of this country know, and I believe that every fair-minded man and woman knows that these actual figures refute the implied slurs on the patriotism of our farmers. They do more than that, Mr. Speaker. They show very clearly that if America is going to continue to eat as we want to eat that some of the Government agencies are going to have to try to find some way of letting the farmer get a fair price, a price that will enable him to continue to produce, rather than to try to find ways and means whereby other groups can get their food for an ever decreasing percentage of their income. I am not asking for \$3 wheat or 40-cent cotton, although we had these

prices during the last war. I am asking simply that the farmer be given a fair share of whatever the national income may be. Unless that is done, it is no answer to say that the farmers' prices have increased.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] for 15 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

DISUNITY THRIVES IN TEXAS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to express my appreciation of the splendid address we have listened to from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. He has presented a very lucid statement about the farmer's problem. It is in sharp contrast with the rather curious and circuitous line of reasoning that the gentleman's colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been giving us from the standpoint of farm subsidies, and I congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] on his factual statement and his courageous analysis of the agricultural situation.

The farmers of this country must not have fastened on them the stigma of asking the returned soldiers from this war to assume the costs of living in this country at a time when our national in-

come is at an all-time high. This fantastic scheme comes not from the farmers, but from a small coterie of politicians who are more interested in farm votes than they are in farm income.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes along the same line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel, as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has just stated, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] should be complimented on the facts he has brought out here today. I would like to add this one thing to the subject in connection with corn: In October 1936 we were receiving \$1.02 for corn in southwestern Minnesota, whereas today we receive 91 and 92 cents per bushel. If the farmer can be accused of receiving too much today under present conditions, when he pays twice as much for labor as he paid in 1936 and when everything else is out of proportion accordingly, there is something entirely wrong with the figures of those who decide what farm commodities are now worth. In order to produce the necessary food, the farmer must be given the prices for his products which will enable him to feed our Nation; otherwise he cannot do his best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in what my colleagues have just said concerning the very splendid discussion of agricultural prices which our distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has just given the House.

I rise for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that the O. P. A. price ceiling on beef cattle went into effect yesterday. On Tuesday the Committee on Agriculture of the House was assured by officials from the O. P. A. that the ceiling would work, and they stated they felt sure that it would not in any way disturb the normal flow of cattle to market. I just want to say at this time that reliable reports which I have from the market centers of the country indicate that there was confusion and disorder in every great cattle market in the country yesterday, and that as a result of this confusion there were 3,500 fat cattle which were carried over on the market at Kansas City yesterday. It is almost an unprecedented situation to have 3,500 fat cattle carried over on the Kansas City market on Wednesday. Reports from other markets are similar.

The only reason for the failure of the markets to function is the confusing and incomprehensible order which has been issued by O. P. A.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Is it not also true that the four gentlemen who testified before the committee did not even inform us that they were going to put this in, and is it not also a fact that none of them has had any experience on the farm, and is it not a fact that three of the four are Harvard graduates, according to their own statements?

Mr. HOPE. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. That is my recollection of the statements made by those gentlemen before the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY STABILIZATION

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by including a statement made by Mr. R. M. Evans, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, of course, everybody knows that in all that is good Iowa affords the best. There is a little village in about the center of the northwest quarter of Iowa named Laurens. Like Goldsmith's village it is the fairest village of the plain. It is also my home town. We produced there a young man named R. M. Evans, who is now one of the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board. He recently gave a statement to one of the Iowa papers, in which he discussed plans for international

currency stabilization, which I think is informative, concise, and valuable. Most of these money experts talk in such scientific and cabalistic language that ordinary folks cannot understand them. I place this in the record, as it is a very concise and clear statement of what is proposed by way of international currency stabilization.

It is as follows:

PLANS FOR INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY STABILIZATION

A great deal of study has been given to a program for creating an international currency stabilization fund in the post-war period. A currency stabilization fund would be important and useful but we should not lose sight of the fact that the mechanism of such a fund cannot, by itself, bring universal prosperity.

When all is said and done, it is simply a machine for doing a job, and unless the conditions in the respective countries are carefully watched and are favorable to agriculture, industry, and commerce the machinery of a fund would not work at all and the fund by itself could not change these conditions.

True, recommendations might be made to countries but the countries themselves have their own legislative and administrative machinery for making these changes and they are not going to act in accordance with the desires of other countries unless they are certain such a course would be in their own best interests.

EFFECT UPON THE TARIFF

Several of these programs were discussed at a recent meeting and one of those present asked whether or not the stabilization fund would operate to deprive industry of tariff protection. Such a question indicates that some people are expecting this machinery to undertake things that are far beyond its scope.

The answer, of course, to this question is that the proposal has nothing whatsoever to do with raising or lowering tariffs. Tariffs are adjusted by Congress or by trade agreements in this country.

With a view to presenting a simplified picture of the main functions performed by a fund of this kind, I am setting forth a few of the main features of such a fund and leaving the details to those who are expert in this particular field.

FROM WAR TO PEACE

When the war ends Great Britain, Germany, Russia, and other countries will try to reconvert their wartime industries to the commerce of peace as rapidly as possible.

They will need foodstuffs and industrial raw materials (cotton, oil, metals, etc.) as well as machinery and other things for which they will not be able to pay by exporting their own goods and services because their factories will not be equipped for peacetime production.

Many of them will be short of gold with which to make payment and they may not find it feasible to arrange private credits in financial centers.

Some of the most acute situations will have to be met by direct relief measures, and a United Nations organization is in the making to handle this big job.

LONG-TERM CREDITS

In other cases which are not so severe the problem will be to extend credit to bridge over the period until the countries concerned can pay their own way again by exporting to the rest of the world. It is to be hoped that such credits can be arranged mostly on a long-term basis, since it will take many of the devastated countries some time to develop production to the point where they can

start repayment by exporting more than they import.

Such long-term credits will have to be negotiated on a specific basis with countries like the United States, which will have a surplus of goods and services, although it may be possible to work out a plan whereby the various creditor countries can coordinate their lending activities through some international institution.

A CUSHION FUND

Finally, however, it would seem desirable to let foreign countries have a "cushion" of short-term credit with which they could operate during the transitional period. This is one of the initial purposes of the fund, and one which can be served only by having some sort of fund set up as soon as the war ends.

For example, if England wanted to buy cotton and there were no dollars available in the market because they had all been used in the purchase of other American products, she would give the fund English pounds sterling equal to the number of American dollars needed to pay for the cotton. The rate of exchange would be fixed within relatively narrow limits. The English manufacturers would weave the cotton into goods to be sold, let us say, to America for dollars and to Brazil for cruzeiros. The dollars could then be returned to the fund and the English would receive their pounds back.

COFFEE FROM BRAZIL

The United States might want to buy some coffee from Brazil so we would trade American dollars to England for Brazilian cruzeiros, which the English received from Brazil in payment for cotton goods sold by England to Brazil. We would then use the Brazilian cruzeiros to pay for the coffee. The rate of exchange in each case would be the rate set by the fund. The English would again receive their pounds back and the fund, as far as England is concerned, would be in relative balance.

It is important to understand that the fund would not in any way interfere with ordinary exchange transactions in the market. It would only handle such uncleared transactions as might develop after all dealings in the market will have been effected. It will enter into the picture at the point where gold used to enter in the gold standard days.

If the conditions in the world are favorable to agriculture, commerce, and industry, and if people are willing to trade with each other without being too nationalistic in their viewpoint, the fund will balance over a period of years and prove to be a simple and effective device for facilitating trade.

"FOUR FREEDOMS" FOR ALL

In this country we are vitally interested in seeing that people return to their peacetime pursuits as quickly as possible after hostilities cease.

World conditions will still be chaotic, and if mass unemployment, unrest, and starvation were long continued, conditions would again be ripe for a revolution—and revolutions bring dictators.

If democracy is to thrive as the future type of government, it will have to provide a steadily rising standard of living. The "four freedoms" will have to be visible to all.

A SAFETY MEASURE

When making loans from the fund to the war-torn countries in order to permit them to purchase raw materials and equipment, short-term credit should be given—and of course it would be necessary, not only for the safety of the fund itself but for the well-being of the borrower, to see that the volume of such loans is in keeping with the commerce of the country involved. Long-term loans for capital investments, such as building airways and factories and developing water

power, should be outside the field covered by the machinery of the fund.

The effect of such loans on the future ability of the country to pay or of our country to receive payments in goods and services would have to be carefully considered.

NOT AS IN THE TWENTIES

Maybe American investors will become more internationally minded as time goes on, but the point I want to emphasize is that we should not mix long-term financing with the short-time commercial operations of the fund.

It would be folly to repeat the error of the twenties and loan money that could not be repaid, and yet we must take a modest risk in order to achieve an over-all good.

You may well ask the question, "How will England sell enough goods and services to pay back the amount of money she takes from the fund at the beginning?"

We might just as well face the fact now that England, or any other country for that matter, cannot pay us unless the people in America are prepared to accept goods and services in return for the material and equipment we sell. This would hold equally true for all the other members of the fund.

There was a time prior to the First World War when it was unnecessary to give much thought to this particular question because the United States was in debt to the countries of the Old World, and day by day the interest and amortization payments fell due in American dollars and were accumulated by the British, French, and other peoples. These dollars were used to purchase our cotton, wheat, automobiles, and other products. However, conditions have changed. British and other foreign investments in this country have been largely liquidated. We are now out of debt to foreign countries and, instead, they are heavily indebted to us.

FOUR COURSES OF ACTION

Assuming we want to continue in the export business there are four courses of action to follow:

First, we could accept gold in payment for the difference between what we buy and what we sell. At the present time we have more gold than we need for commercial uses and backing for our currency. More gold would be quite useless unless we were prepared to use it in purchasing goods and services from the rest of the world.

W. P. A. PROJECT

Second, we could give away our surplus commodities and services to the rest of the world, considering such a move a W. P. A. project to create work and employment in this country.

But this would be philanthropy—not trade—and the question would naturally be raised, "Why wouldn't it be better to use the surplus material and labor to build houses or something that would increase the standard of living for the people in this country?"

Living standards can be improved in all countries, and they must be improved if trade is to flourish. Business people in America cannot trade in a worth-while way with bankrupt people in other lands.

The third course of action would be to make long-term loans. These loans would furnish countries with money to purchase materials they could not otherwise pay for. Long-term loans would simply postpone the day of settlement to some future time when we might be willing to accept payment in goods and services.

BUYING FROM ABROAD

Our fourth course of action, which is the one we must adopt if a mechanism of this kind is to become really useful, would be to purchase sufficient goods and services from abroad to pay for what we sell.

LXXXIX—560

Now, transactions of this kind are not quite as complicated as one might believe. Suppose England buys some cotton, wheat, pork, machinery, and automobiles from this country—it does not necessarily follow that we must purchase directly from England in order to secure payment. We might buy coffee from Brazil and rubber from the Orient, and the money Brazil and the Orient, for instance, owe to Great Britain for goods and services purchased could be used by Great Britain to pay for its purchases from us through the fund at relatively constant rates of exchange.

One of the genuine aids to business would be the relative stability of exchange rates. Future plans could be made with greater safety if these exchange rates were not subject to speculative changes from time to time.

IMPORTS NECESSARY

The main point to keep in mind is that if we are going to export in a businesslike way it will be necessary to import, and if we import as much as we export, a fund can furnish the machinery to make the operation efficient and economical.

But if we are unprepared to accept imports in a volume equivalent to our exports, we might just as well face reality and forget the fund because no fund of this kind could operate successfully over a period of time unless we follow the fourth course of action outlined above.

In order to accomplish this result, it is not necessary to import products that would create such competition as to ruin American industry. Trading in many articles and services (in such a way that American agriculture and industry would not be injured) with other countries would help to increase employment and raise our standard of living.

ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS

Foreign trade is very similar to business between individuals.

If you go downtown and buy a suit of clothes or some groceries from the corner store, you ordinarily use money to pay for them. You earned the money by selling your own goods or services to someone else. As long as you do that, you are all right and the economy is all right, but if you lose your job or your crops are a failure and you do not have money to pay for the things you want, someone will have to give the money to you or you will have to borrow.

If the money is given to you, that closes the transaction, but if you borrow to pay for these things you will have to sell your goods, crops, or services sometime in the future to pay off the loan—and so it is between nations.

The currency stabilization fund, by itself, is merely machinery for the smooth operation of international trade. True, it has certain supervisory functions. One function is to keep exchange rates from fluctuating too widely in order to prevent the retarding of commerce. You know how it is in your own business—when prices fluctuate wildly, you cannot operate efficiently or economically. Stabilization of exchanges within relatively narrow limits helps to promote trade.

WILL IT WORK?

The basic fact we must face at this time is not so much the particular kind of stabilization fund we are going to set up, but rather the all-important question of whether our Nation and the other nations of the world are going to create an atmosphere and condition in which agriculture, industry, and commerce can thrive.

If we do this, we will have peace and prosperity for generations to come. If not, we might just as well oil our guns and keep our ammunition dry.

If, after the war, the inhabitants of countries participating in the fund are enabled to have a good standard of living, then they will be in a frame of mind to retain a peaceful and democratic type of government.

If, on the other hand, agriculture, industry, and commerce are throttled and retarded by unwise national policies and the selfish interests of individuals and countries, these favorable conditions will not exist and an economic stabilization fund would be just one more piece of useless machinery that started out to achieve a very desirable result but could not accomplish that purpose because conditions were against it.

American agriculture and industry cannot maintain maximum production unless a reasonable percentage of their products are exported. Surpluses of farm products and surpluses of labor will hold down our national income.

POST-WAR TASKS

Just stop and think for a moment about the national income of the post-war period. We will have to service our debt.

We will have to maintain a large Army and Navy.

We will have to pay the expenses of expanded social services that have been created and have proved their worth.

All of this can be done and we can have a far better standard of living than we have ever enjoyed if we do sufficient business to keep our American economy operating in high gear.

You hear some people say, "Well, we will live within ourselves and if others want to buy our products, let them come and get them."

They might more accurately say, "Let us have unemployment and a low standard of living." But no one would publicly advocate the latter, though too often we unwittingly do things that have this bad result.

I have purposely omitted consideration of the necessary and important administrative details that will have to be worked out in order to put a stabilization fund into successful operation. I believe our Government should lay down certain general guides and leave to some capable agency the working out of the plan. Congress should demand a full and complete report each year so it can alter the course as it deems best in the interests of our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Members of the House that they are invited to the ceremony which will take place at 1:15 this afternoon in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building where a number of women will be sworn in as WAC's. It will be a very impressive ceremony and I know the Members will be interested.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous-consent

requests: One, that I may revise and extend my own remarks and include a letter from a group of dairymen from Men-den, Okla., and in another extension of remarks to include a resolution from a group of dairymen in Holgate, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, November 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 11 a. m. on Friday, October 29, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 3142, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2203, to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes (relative to State income taxes, determination of domicile, etc.), also at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled, "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3564. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Los Angeles, in the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3565. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, for 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3566. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3567. A bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, to provide additional safeguards for the protection of explosives and ingredients thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Res. 336. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to certain action contemplated by the United States in connection with post-war relief and rehabilitation in foreign countries; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 3568. A bill for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Francis T. Lillie and Lois E. Lillie; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3310. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of August Meier and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3311. Also, petition of Philip Drzwiecke and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3312. Also, petition of Edw. C. Schmid and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3313. Also, petition of William Metzger and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3314. Also, petition of the Sligo Iron Store Co. and signed by 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3315. Also, petition of Edward M. Lohse, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3316. Also, petition of Clare L. Garrity, of Washington, D. C., and 19 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3317. Also, petition of Arthur Davis, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, pro-

testing against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3318. Also, petition of Morris J. Taney, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3319. Also, petition of the Trocadero Cafe, of Washington, D. C., signed by 20 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3320. Also, petition of David E. Barry, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3321. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petitions of Andrew Easdale and 30 other citizens of Hunnewell, Mrs. R. L. McClain and 19 other citizens of Laredo, Mrs. H. R. Foroner and 21 other citizens of Memphis, and Mrs. Russell Atkins and 19 other citizens of Livingston County, all of the State of Missouri, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3322. Also, petitions of D. J. Van Desander and 75 other citizens of Hannibal, Mrs. Lillie Green and 40 signers from La Belle, Mrs. Bertha Luker and 50 other citizens of Knox City, L. O. VanNostrand and 40 other citizens of Milan, all of the State of Missouri, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3323. By Mr. SCRIVENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Iola, Allen County, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3324. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of C. A. Schafer and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all life, whose light is truth, whose warmth is love, we thank Thee for the miracle of dawn which calls to holy dedication of renewed powers, for noon-tide with its summons to play the man in a solemn day that demands our best, and for the quiet of twilight, like bells at evening pealing, which brings whispers of that realm where beyond these voices there is peace. In the busy hours of life's midday so teach us to think and act and toil that we may justify the lofty pedestal of our privilege. Desiring nothing for ourselves that we do not hope for all mankind, may we strive to open for each human being the gates of an equal opportunity and an equal chance to become the best it is in him to be. Our eyes having seen the glory of a government of law bring peace and prosper-